

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

9

AD-A264 977



DTIC
ELECTE
MAY 14 1993
S B D

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE;
DISTRIBUTION IS UNLIMITED

FY 1994 BUDGET ESTIMATES

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING

**JUSTIFICATION DATA
SUBMITTED TO CONGRESS
APRIL 1993**

FY 1994 VOLUME 1

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES
OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES
VARIOUS WORLDWIDE
FAMILY HOUSING

TABLE OF CONTENTS
 FY 1994 PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

General:	PAGE
Table of Contents.....	A
Program Summary.....	B
State List (List of Projects).....	C-1
New Mission/Current Mission Exhibit.....	D
 Military Construction	
Installation Index.....	E-1
 Special Program Considerations	
Statements.....	F-1
Congressional Reporting Requirements.....	F-2
Third Party Financing.....	F-3
 Non-MILCON Construction	
Research and Development.....	F-5
Operations and Maintenance.....	F-8
 Budget Data:	
Appropriations Language.....	G-1
Program and Financing Schedule.....	G-2
Object Classification Schedule.....	G-4
Projects Inside the United States.....	1
Projects Outside the United States.....	544
Planning and Design.....	577
Unspecified Minor Construction.....	579
Defense Access Roads.....	581
\$One Million and Under.....	586
Defense Business Operations Fund (DBOF).....	659
Family Housing.....	720

93 4 26 042

93-08787



DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM
FISCAL YEAR 1994

	PROJECT <u>AUTH</u>	AUTH FOR <u>APPROP</u>	<u>APPROP</u>
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION	(SEC 2301)	(SEC 2304)	
Inside the United States	729,152	729,152	729,152
Defense Access Roads (Whiteman)	23 USC 210	7,150	7,150
Maxwell Runway Extension	(1)	(1)	9,200
Eglin Climatic Test Chamber	(2)	57,000	57,000
Outside the United States	33,852	33,852	33,852
Planning and Design	10 USC 2807	63,180	63,180
Unspecified Minor Construction	10 USC 2805	6,844	6,844
TOTAL MILITARY CONSTRUCTION	736,004	897,178	906,378
 MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING	 (Sec 2302/2303)	 (Sec 2304)	
New Construction	110,264	110,264	110,264
Improvements	53,070	53,070	53,070
Planning and Design	<u>9,901</u>	<u>9,901</u>	<u>9,901</u>
Subtotal	173,235	173,235	173,235
Operations, Utilities, and Maintenance		735,625	735,625
Leasing		118,260	118,260
Debt Payment		<u>21</u>	<u>21</u>
Subtotal	173,235	853,912	853,912
TOTAL MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING	173,235	1,027,147	1,027,147
GRAND TOTAL AIR FORCE	909,239	1,924,325	1,933,525

(1) Project authorization and authorization for appropriation provided in FY 1993

(2) Project authorization provided in FY 1993

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 8

codes
and/or
special

A-1

B

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
INDEX
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 1994
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)
INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

STATE/COUNTRY <u>INSTALLATION</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>	PROJECT <u>AUTH</u>	AUTH FOR <u>APPROP</u>	APPROP <u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
ALABAMA					
GUNTER ANNEX					
	HAZARDOUS WASTE ACCUMULATION FACILITY	310	310	310	581
	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	2,700	2,700	2,700	1A
	EMERGENCY POWER GENERATOR PLANT	1,200	1,200	1,200	2
	SPILL CONTAINMENT CONTROLS	470	470	470	583
	<u>GUNTER ANNEX TOTAL:</u>	<u>4,680</u>	<u>4,680</u>	<u>4,680</u>	
MAXWELL AFB					
	EXTEND RUNWAY/UPGRADE	0	0	9,200	6
	TAXIWAY/RAMP	3,800	3,800	3,800	9
	AIR FORCE QUALITY CENTER	4,650	4,650	4,650	12
	UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	1,700	1,700	1,700	15
	SPILL CONTAINMENT CONTROLS	970	970	970	585
	UPGRADE UTILITY SYSTEMS, PHASE I	5,050	5,050	5,050	17
	<u>MAXWELL AFB TOTAL:</u>	<u>16,170</u>	<u>16,170</u>	<u>25,370</u>	
	<u>ALABAMA TOTAL:</u>	<u>20,850</u>	<u>20,850</u>	<u>30,050</u>	
ALASKA					
CAPE ROMANZOF LRRS					
	REPLACE TRAMWAY SYSTEM	3,350	3,350	3,350	21
	<u>CAPE ROMANZOF LRRS TOTAL:</u>	<u>3,350</u>	<u>3,350</u>	<u>3,350</u>	
EIELSON AFB					
	FIRE TRAINING FACILITY	2,400	2,400	2,400	25
	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	5,400	5,400	5,400	28
	<u>EIELSON AFB TOTAL:</u>	<u>7,800</u>	<u>7,800</u>	<u>7,800</u>	
ELMENDORF AFB					
	CORROSION CONTROL FACILITY	5,975	5,975	5,975	32

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
INDEX
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 1994
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)
INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

<u>STATE/COUNTRY</u> <u>INSTALLATION</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>PROJECT</u> <u>AUTH</u>	<u>AUTH</u> <u>FOR</u> <u>APPROP</u>	<u>APPROP</u> <u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
	MUNITIONS MAINTENANCE FACILITY	2,100	2,100	2,100	35
	MUNITIONS EQUIPMENT FACILITY	1,860	1,860	1,860	38
	HAZARDOUS WASTE STORAGE FACILITY	3,900	3,900	3,900	41
	DINING FACILITY	6,800	6,800	6,800	44
	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	5,070	5,070	5,070	47
	ADD TO SANITARY SEWER SYSTEM	5,100	5,100	5,100	50
	<u>ELMENDORF AFB TOTAL:</u>	<u>30,805</u>	<u>30,805</u>	<u>30,805</u>	
	<u>ALASKA TOTAL:</u>	<u>41,955</u>	<u>41,955</u>	<u>41,955</u>	
ARIZONA					
DAVIS-MONTHAN AFB					
	UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	650	650	650	587
	<u>DAVIS-MONTHAN AFB TOTAL:</u>	<u>650</u>	<u>650</u>	<u>650</u>	
LUKE AFB					
	FIRE TRAINING FACILITY	800	800	800	590
	UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	1,250	1,250	1,250	55
	DINING FACILITY	4,700	4,700	4,700	58
	<u>LUKE AFB TOTAL:</u>	<u>6,750</u>	<u>6,750</u>	<u>6,750</u>	
NAVAJO ARMY DEPOT					
	ALTER MINUTEMAN II STORAGE FACILITIES	7,250	7,250	7,250	62
	<u>NAVAJO ARMY DEPOT TOTAL:</u>	<u>7,250</u>	<u>7,250</u>	<u>7,250</u>	
	<u>ARIZONA TOTAL:</u>	<u>14,650</u>	<u>14,650</u>	<u>14,650</u>	
ARKANSAS					
LITTLE ROCK AFB					
	ALTER JRTC OPERATIONS CENTER	1,050	1,050	1,050	66
	ADD/ALTER ENGINE INSPECTION AND REPAIR SHOP (DBOF)	1,200	1,200	1,200	69

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
INDEX
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 1994
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)
INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

<u>STATE/COUNTRY</u> <u>INSTALLATION</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>PROJECT</u> <u>AUTH</u>	<u>AUTH</u> <u>FOR</u> <u>APPROP</u>	<u>APPROP</u> <u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
	ADD TO AND ALTER CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER (DBOF)	2,250	2,250	2,250	71
	<u>LITTLE ROCK AFB TOTAL:</u>	<u>4,500</u>	<u>4,500</u>	<u>4,500</u>	
	<u>ARKANSAS TOTAL:</u>	<u>4,500</u>	<u>4,500</u>	<u>4,500</u>	
CALIFORNIA					
EDWARDS AFB					
	UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS, PHASE II	5,400	5,400	5,400	75
	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	5,900	5,900	5,900	78
	<u>EDWARDS AFB TOTAL:</u>	<u>11,300</u>	<u>11,300</u>	<u>11,300</u>	
MCCLELLAN AFB					
	FIRE PROTECTION AIRCRAFT FACILITIES (DBOF)	1,900	1,900	1,900	86
	<u>MCCLELLAN AFB TOTAL:</u>	<u>1,900</u>	<u>1,900</u>	<u>1,900</u>	
TRAVIS AFB					
	AIRCRAFT GENERAL PURPOSE MAINTENANCE SHOP	11,200	11,200	11,200	89
	UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS (DBOF)	2,840	2,840	2,840	92
	<u>TRAVIS AFB TOTAL:</u>	<u>14,040</u>	<u>14,040</u>	<u>14,040</u>	
VANDENBERG AFB					
	SLFI-TPQ-18 RADAR FACILITY	2,408	2,408	2,408	93
	HARDWARE STORAGE FACILITY	3,500	3,500	3,500	96
	UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	1,700	1,700	1,700	99
	SLFI-UPGRADE ELECTRICAL SYSTEM	11,520	11,520	11,520	102
	SLFI-UPGRADE FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM	1,600	1,600	1,600	105
	<u>VANDENBERG AFB TOTAL:</u>	<u>20,728</u>	<u>20,728</u>	<u>20,728</u>	
	<u>CALIFORNIA TOTAL:</u>	<u>47,968</u>	<u>47,968</u>	<u>47,968</u>	

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
INDEX
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 1994
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)
INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

STATE/COUNTRY <u>INSTALLATION</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>PROJECT AUTH</u>	<u>AUTH FOR APPROP</u>	<u>APPROP AMOUNT</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
CLASSIFIED LOCATIONS					
CLASSIFIED LOCATIONS					
	SPECIAL TACTICAL UNIT DETACHMENT FACILITY	5,540	5,540	5,540	109
	OMEGA FACILITIES	2,600	2,600	2,600	110
	<u>CLASSIFIED LOCATIONS TOTAL:</u>	<u>8.140</u>	<u>8.140</u>	<u>8.140</u>	
	<u>CLASSIFIED LOCATIONS TOTAL:</u>	<u>8.140</u>	<u>8.140</u>	<u>8.140</u>	
COLORADO					
BUCKLEY ANGB					
	COMMUNICATION DATA PROCESSING FACILITY	39,000	39,000	39,000	111A
	<u>BUCKLEY ANGB TOTAL:</u>	<u>39.000</u>	<u>39.000</u>	<u>39.000</u>	
CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN AFB					
	UPGRADE ELECTRICAL SERVICE	4,450	4,450	4,450	113
	<u>CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN AFB TOTAL:</u>	<u>4.450</u>	<u>4.450</u>	<u>4.450</u>	
PETERSON AFB					
	ADD TO AND ALTER INTEGRATION SUPPORT FACILITY, PHASE II	16,400	16,400	16,400	118
	PRECISION MEASUREMENT EQUIPMENT LABORATORY	2,200	2,200	2,200	121
	TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT FACILITY	2,430	2,430	2,430	124
	<u>PETERSON AFB TOTAL:</u>	<u>21.030</u>	<u>21.030</u>	<u>21.030</u>	
USAF ACADEMY					
	ENHANCED FLIGHT SCREENER HANGARS	3,800	3,800	3,800	128
	UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	780	780	780	593
	ADD TO AND ALTER WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT	7,100	7,100	7,100	131
	<u>USAF ACADEMY TOTAL:</u>	<u>11.680</u>	<u>11.680</u>	<u>11.680</u>	
	<u>COLORADO TOTAL:</u>	<u>76.160</u>	<u>76.160</u>	<u>76.160</u>	

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
INDEX
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 1994
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)
INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

STATE/COUNTRY <u>INSTALLATION</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>PROJECT AUTH</u>	<u>AUTH FOR APPROP</u>	<u>APPROP AMOUNT</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
DELAWARE					
DOVER AFB					
	INSTALL EMISSION CONTROL DEVICES	860	860	860	596
	DORMITORY (DBOF)	3,200	3,200	3,200	135
	ADD TO AND ALTER DINING FACILITY (DBOF)	2,500	2,500	2,500	138
	<u>DOVER AFB TOTAL:</u>	<u>6,560</u>	<u>6,560</u>	<u>6,560</u>	
	<u>DELAWARE TOTAL:</u>	<u>6,560</u>	<u>6,560</u>	<u>6,560</u>	
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA					
BOLLING AFB					
	ADD TO CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	2,000	2,000	2,000	142
	<u>BOLLING AFB TOTAL:</u>	<u>2,000</u>	<u>2,000</u>	<u>2,000</u>	
	<u>DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TOTAL:</u>	<u>2,000</u>	<u>2,000</u>	<u>2,000</u>	
FLORIDA					
CAPE CANAVERAL AFS					
	UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	400	400	400	599
	SLFI-BACKUP POWER	2,500	2,500	2,500	147
	SLFI-BACKUP POWER	800	800	800	601
	SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT	11,900	11,900	11,900	150
	SLFI-UPGRADE WATER SUPPLY MAINS	1,200	1,200	1,200	153
	SLFI-UPGRADE FIRE SYSTEM	2,400	2,400	2,400	156
	<u>CAPE CANAVERAL AFS TOTAL:</u>	<u>19,200</u>	<u>19,200</u>	<u>19,200</u>	
EGLIN AFB					
	UPGRADE HYDRANT FUELING SYSTEM	4,550	4,550	4,550	160
	REPLACE POL PIPELINE	3,300	3,300	3,300	163
	AIRCRAFT ENGINE TEST FACILITY	1,600	1,600	1,600	166

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
INDEX
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 1994
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)
INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

<u>STATE/COUNTRY</u> <u>INSTALLATION</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>PROJECT</u> <u>AUTH</u>	<u>AUTH</u> <u>FOR</u> <u>APPROP</u>	<u>APPROP</u> <u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
	VEHICLE MAINTENANCE/WAREHOUSE FACILITIES	2,600	2,600	2,600	169
	RENOVATE CLIMATIC TEST CHAMBER, PHASE II	0	57,000	57,000	172
	<u>EGLIN AFB TOTAL:</u>	<u>12.050</u>	<u>69.050</u>	<u>69.050</u>	
EGLIN AUXILIARY 9					
	ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES	4,479	4,479	4,479	176
	UPGRADE SANITARY SEWAGE SYSTEM	1,750	1,750	1,750	179
	UPGRADE STORM SEWAGE SYSTEM	1,600	1,600	1,600	182
	<u>EGLIN AUXILIARY 9 TOTAL:</u>	<u>7.829</u>	<u>7.829</u>	<u>7.829</u>	
PATRICK AFB					
	ALTER MAINTENANCE HANGAR	2,000	2,000	2,000	186
	UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	1,850	1,850	1,850	189
	<u>PATRICK AFB TOTAL:</u>	<u>3.850</u>	<u>3.850</u>	<u>3.850</u>	
TYNDALL AFB					
	BASE SUPPLY LOGISTICS CENTER	2,600	2,600	2,600	193
	<u>TYNDALL AFB TOTAL:</u>	<u>2.600</u>	<u>2.600</u>	<u>2.600</u>	
	<u>FLORIDA TOTAL:</u>	<u>45.529</u>	<u>102.529</u>	<u>102.529</u>	
GEORGIA					
ROBINS AFB					
	J-STARS ADD TO AND ALTER OPERATIONS COMPLEX	4,100	4,100	4,100	198
	J-STARS SQUADRON OPERATIONS/AMU	7,500	7,500	7,500	201
	J-STARS ADD TO AND ALTER MAINTENANCE COMPLEX	9,300	9,300	9,300	204
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT PAINT FACILITY	970	970	970	604
	ADD TO AND ALTER LOGISTICAL SYSTEMS OPERATIONS CENTER	3,000	3,000	3,000	207

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
INDEX
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 1994
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)
INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

STATE/COUNTRY <u>INSTALLATION</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>PROJECT AUTH</u>	<u>AUTH FOR APPROP</u>	<u>APPROP AMOUNT</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
	ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES (DBOF)	4,300	4,300	4,300	210
	J-STARS ADD TO AND ALTER UTILITIES	3,500	3,500	3,500	213
	UPGRADE INDUSTRIAL WASTEWATER TREATMENT AND DISPOSAL PLANTS	10,700	10,700	10,700	216
	<u>ROBINS AFB TOTAL:</u>	<u>43,370</u>	<u>43,370</u>	<u>43,370</u>	
	<u>GEORGIA TOTAL:</u>	<u>43,370</u>	<u>43,370</u>	<u>43,370</u>	
HAWAII					
HICKAM AFB					
	MILSTAR COMMUNICATIONS GROUND TERMINAL	2,200	2,200	2,200	219A
	UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	2,100	2,100	2,100	220
	DORMITORY	5,950	5,950	5,950	223
	<u>HICKAM AFB TOTAL:</u>	<u>10,250</u>	<u>10,250</u>	<u>10,250</u>	
KAENA POINT STS					
	POWER PLANT	7,350	7,350	7,350	227
	<u>KAENA POINT STS TOTAL:</u>	<u>7,350</u>	<u>7,350</u>	<u>7,350</u>	
	<u>HAWAII TOTAL:</u>	<u>17,600</u>	<u>17,600</u>	<u>17,600</u>	
ILLINOIS					
SCOTT AFB					
	INTEROPERABILITY TEST AND TRAINING FACILITY	5,000	5,000	5,000	231
	MUNITIONS STORAGE FACILITY/ LAND ACQUISITION (DBOF)	2,450	2,450	2,450	234
	<u>SCOTT AFB TOTAL:</u>	<u>7,450</u>	<u>7,450</u>	<u>7,450</u>	
	<u>ILLINOIS TOTAL:</u>	<u>7,450</u>	<u>7,450</u>	<u>7,450</u>	
KANSAS					
MCCONNELL AFB					
	CONTROL TOWER CAB	900	900	900	607

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
INDEX
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 1994
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)
INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

<u>STATE/COUNTRY</u> <u>INSTALLATION</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>PROJECT</u> <u>AUTH</u>	<u>AUTH</u> <u>FOR</u> <u>APPROP</u>	<u>APPROP</u> <u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
	LAND RESTRICTIVE EASEMENT ACQUISITION	1,000	1,000	1,000	610
	<u>MCCONNELL AFB TOTAL:</u>	<u>1,900</u>	<u>1,900</u>	<u>1,900</u>	
	<u>KANSAS TOTAL:</u>	<u>1,900</u>	<u>1,900</u>	<u>1,900</u>	
LOUISIANA BARKSDALE AFB					
	UPGRADE BULK STORAGE BASINS	1,600	1,600	1,600	239
	WEAPONS STORAGE AREA SECURITY	960	960	960	613
	<u>BARKSDALE AFB TOTAL:</u>	<u>2,560</u>	<u>2,560</u>	<u>2,560</u>	
	<u>LOUISIANA TOTAL:</u>	<u>2,560</u>	<u>2,560</u>	<u>2,560</u>	
MARYLAND ANDREWS AFB					
	AIR FREIGHT TERMINAL (DBOF)	4,400	4,400	4,400	243
	FIRE TRAINING FACILITY (DBOF)	1,000	1,000	1,000	616
	UPGRADE COMPOSITE ADMINISTRATION FACILITY (DBOF)	9,940	9,940	9,940	246
	UPGRADE SANITARY SEWER SYSTEMS	2,650	2,650	2,650	249
	<u>ANDREWS AFB TOTAL:</u>	<u>17,990</u>	<u>17,990</u>	<u>17,990</u>	
FORT GEORGE G. MEADE					
	ADD TO OPERATIONS FACILITY	1,450	1,450	1,450	253
	<u>FORT GEORGE G. MEADE TOTAL:</u>	<u>1,450</u>	<u>1,450</u>	<u>1,450</u>	
	<u>MARYLAND TOTAL:</u>	<u>19,440</u>	<u>19,440</u>	<u>19,440</u>	
MISSISSIPPI COLUMBUS AFB					
	UPGRADE AIRFIELD LIGHTING	2,900	2,900	2,900	257
	<u>COLUMBUS AFB TOTAL:</u>	<u>2,900</u>	<u>2,900</u>	<u>2,900</u>	
KEESLER AFB					
	FIRE TRAINING FACILITY	690	690	690	619

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
INDEX
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 1994
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)
INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

<u>STATE/COUNTRY</u> <u>INSTALLATION</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>PROJECT</u> <u>AUTH</u>	<u>AUTH</u> <u>FOR</u> <u>APPROP</u>	<u>APPROP</u> <u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
	UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	600	600	600	622
	UPGRADE STUDENT DORMITORY	4,500	4,500	4,500	261
	UPGRADE SANITARY SEWER SYSTEM	2,920	2,920	2,920	264
	<u>KEESLER AFB TOTAL:</u>	<u>8,710</u>	<u>8,710</u>	<u>8,710</u>	
	<u>MISSISSIPPI TOTAL:</u>	<u>11,610</u>	<u>11,610</u>	<u>11,610</u>	
MISSOURI					
WHITEMAN AFB					
	B-2 AIRCRAFT APRON/TAXIWAY UPGRADE	3,400	3,400	3,400	269
	B-2 HYDRANT FUEL LOOP II, PHASE II	2,700	2,700	2,700	271
	B-2 AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE DOCKS	14,500	14,500	14,500	274
	B-2 VEHICLE MAINTENANCE FACILITY	1,700	1,700	1,700	277
	B-2 ADD TO AND ALTER MUNITIONS STORAGE FACILITIES	3,338	3,338	3,338	280
	B-2 UTILITY UPGRADE	4,850	4,850	4,850	283
	B-2 UPGRADE BASE ROADS, PHASE I	5,900	5,900	5,900	286
	B-2 DEFENSE ACCESS ROADS	0	7,150	7,150	289
	<u>WHITEMAN AFB TOTAL:</u>	<u>36,388</u>	<u>43,538</u>	<u>43,538</u>	
	<u>MISSOURI TOTAL:</u>	<u>36,388</u>	<u>43,538</u>	<u>43,538</u>	
MONTANA					
MALMSTROM AFB					
	BASE ENGINEERING COMPLEX (DBOF)	6,200	6,200	6,200	294
	UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS MINUTEMAN II FACILITIES	1,500	1,500	1,500	297
	<u>MALMSTROM AFB TOTAL:</u>	<u>7,700</u>	<u>7,700</u>	<u>7,700</u>	
	<u>MONTANA TOTAL:</u>	<u>7,700</u>	<u>7,700</u>	<u>7,700</u>	

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
INDEX
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 1994
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)
INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

STATE/COUNTRY <u>INSTALLATION</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>	PROJECT <u>AUTH</u>	AUTH FOR <u>APPROP</u>	<u>APPROP</u> <u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
NEBRASKA					
OFFUTT AFB					
	REPAIR AIRFIELD PAVEMENTS AND LIGHTING	8,700	8,700	8,700	301
	ADD TO EMERGENCY BACK-UP POWER	2,300	2,300	2,300	304
	<u>OFFUTT AFB TOTAL:</u>	<u>11.000</u>	<u>11.000</u>	<u>11.000</u>	
	<u>NEBRASKA TOTAL:</u>	<u>11.000</u>	<u>11.000</u>	<u>11.000</u>	
NEVADA					
NELLIS AFB					
	UPGRADE POL TANKS	1,650	1,650	1,650	308
	<u>NELLIS AFB TOTAL:</u>	<u>1.650</u>	<u>1.650</u>	<u>1.650</u>	
	<u>NEVADA TOTAL:</u>	<u>1.650</u>	<u>1.650</u>	<u>1.650</u>	
NEW MEXICO					
CANNON AFB					
	SOUND SUPPRESSOR SUPPORT PAD	665	665	665	625
	FIRE TRAINING FACILITY	1,000	1,000	1,000	628
	UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	1,100	1,100	1,100	312
	BASE ENGINEERING COMPLEX	6,150	6,150	6,150	315
	<u>CANNON AFB TOTAL:</u>	<u>8.915</u>	<u>8.915</u>	<u>8.915</u>	
HOLLOMAN AFB					
	UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	1,000	1,000	1,000	631
	ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES	6,400	6,400	6,400	319
	SEWER EFFLUENT SYSTEM	1,800	1,800	1,800	322
	<u>HOLLOMAN AFB TOTAL:</u>	<u>9.200</u>	<u>9.200</u>	<u>9.200</u>	
KIRTLAND AFB					
	AEROSPACE ENGINEERING FACILITY	3,167	3,167	3,167	326
	COMPOSITE MATERIALS LABORATORY	5,750	5,750	5,750	329
	SPACE STRUCTURES LABORATORY	6,200	6,200	6,200	332

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
INDEX
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 1994
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)
INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

STATE/COUNTRY <u>INSTALLATION</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>PROJECT AUTH</u>	<u>AUTH FOR APPROP</u>	<u>APPROP AMOUNT</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
	ALTER DORMITORY	5,100	5,100	5,100	335
	UPGRADE ELECTRICAL DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM	6,844	6,844	6,844	338
	<u>KIRTLAND AFB TOTAL:</u>	<u>27,061</u>	<u>27,061</u>	<u>27,061</u>	
	<u>NEW MEXICO TOTAL:</u>	<u>45,176</u>	<u>45,176</u>	<u>45,176</u>	
NORTH CAROLINA					
POPE AFB					
	ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES	4,300	4,300	4,300	342
	DINING FACILITY	4,300	4,300	4,300	345
	<u>POPE AFB TOTAL:</u>	<u>8,600</u>	<u>8,600</u>	<u>8,600</u>	
SEYMOUR-JOHNSON AFB					
	MUNITIONS MAINTENANCE SUPPORT FACILITY	480	480	480	634
	ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES	4,900	4,900	4,900	349
	<u>SEYMOUR-JOHNSON AFB TOTAL:</u>	<u>5,380</u>	<u>5,380</u>	<u>5,380</u>	
	<u>NORTH CAROLINA TOTAL:</u>	<u>13,980</u>	<u>13,980</u>	<u>13,980</u>	
NORTH DAKOTA					
GRAND FORKS AFB					
	UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	2,600	2,600	2,600	353
	<u>GRAND FORKS AFB TOTAL:</u>	<u>2,600</u>	<u>2,600</u>	<u>2,600</u>	
MINOT AFB					
	UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	2,000	2,000	2,000	357
	<u>MINOT AFB TOTAL:</u>	<u>2,000</u>	<u>2,000</u>	<u>2,000</u>	
	<u>NORTH DAKOTA TOTAL:</u>	<u>4,600</u>	<u>4,600</u>	<u>4,600</u>	
OHIO					
WRIGHT-PATTERSON AFB					
	ADD TO AVIONICS RESEARCH LABORATORY, PHASE II	5,650	5,650	5,650	362

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
INDEX
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 1994
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)
INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

STATE/COUNTRY <u>INSTALLATION</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>	PROJECT <u>AUTH</u>	AUTH FOR <u>APPROP</u>	APPROP <u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
	ADD TO AND ALTER ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT COMPLEX, PHASE II	12,850	12,850	12,850	365
	SEAL FUEL CONTAINMENT DIKES	1,500	1,500	1,500	368
	UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS, PHASE II	3,200	3,200	3,200	370
	RENOVATE ELECTRIC SUBSTATIONS	4,450	4,450	4,450	373
	<u>WRIGHT-PATTERSON AFB TOTAL:</u>	<u>27,650</u>	<u>27,650</u>	<u>27,650</u>	
	<u>OHIO TOTAL:</u>	<u>27,650</u>	<u>27,650</u>	<u>27,650</u>	
OKLAHOMA					
ALTUS AFB					
	C-17 FIRE STATION (DBOF)	780	780	780	637
	C-17 ADD TO FLIGHT SIMULATION TRAINING FACILITY, PHII (DBOF)	2,850	2,850	2,850	377
	C-17 ADD TO AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE FACILITY (DBOF)	3,300	3,300	3,300	380
	<u>ALTUS AFB TOTAL:</u>	<u>6,930</u>	<u>6,930</u>	<u>6,930</u>	
TINKER AFB					
	ALTER HYDRANT FUELING SYSTEM	4,129	4,129	4,129	385
	MILSTAR COMMUNICATIONS GROUND TERMINAL	800	800	800	638A
	SEAL FUEL CONTAINMENT DIKES	620	620	620	639
	UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	4,700	4,700	4,700	388
	ENGINEERING AND CONTRACT SUPPORT FACILITY	5,900	5,900	5,900	391
	INDUSTRIAL WASTEWATER REGIONAL CONNECTION (DBOF)	5,400	5,400	5,400	394
	<u>TINKER AFB TOTAL:</u>	<u>21,549</u>	<u>21,549</u>	<u>21,549</u>	
VANCE AFB					
	UPGRADE AIRFIELD LIGHTING	3,300	3,300	3,300	398
	T-1 SPECIALIZED UPT MAINTENANCE SUPPORT	2,700	2,700	2,700	401

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
INDEX
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 1994
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)
INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

<u>STATE/COUNTRY</u> <u>INSTALLATION</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>PROJECT</u> <u>AUTH</u>	<u>AUTH</u> <u>FOR</u> <u>APPROP</u>	<u>APPROP</u> <u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
	<u>VANCE AFB TOTAL:</u>	<u>6,000</u>	<u>6,000</u>	<u>6,000</u>	
	<u>OKLAHOMA TOTAL:</u>	<u>34,479</u>	<u>34,479</u>	<u>34,479</u>	
SOUTH CAROLINA					
CHARLESTON AFB					
	FIRE TRAINING FACILITY (DBOF)	1,100	1,100	1,100	405
	<u>CHARLESTON AFB TOTAL:</u>	<u>1,100</u>	<u>1,100</u>	<u>1,100</u>	
SHAW AFB					
	CONTROL TOWER	2,700	2,700	2,700	409
	UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	520	520	520	641
	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	2,650	2,650	2,650	412
	<u>SHAW AFB TOTAL:</u>	<u>5,870</u>	<u>5,870</u>	<u>5,870</u>	
	<u>SOUTH CAROLINA TOTAL:</u>	<u>6,970</u>	<u>6,970</u>	<u>6,970</u>	
SOUTH DAKOTA					
ELLSWORTH AFB					
	ALTER AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE DOCK	630	630	630	644
	<u>ELLSWORTH AFB TOTAL:</u>	<u>630</u>	<u>630</u>	<u>630</u>	
	<u>SOUTH DAKOTA TOTAL:</u>	<u>630</u>	<u>630</u>	<u>630</u>	
TENNESSEE					
ARNOLD AFB					
	UPGRADE SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT	1,500	1,500	1,500	417
	<u>ARNOLD AFB TOTAL:</u>	<u>1,500</u>	<u>1,500</u>	<u>1,500</u>	
MEMPHIS NAS					
	ADD TO AND ALTER HIGH-BAY TECHNICAL TRAINING FACILITY	3,000	3,000	3,000	421
	ALTER TECHNICAL TRAINING FACILITY	2,000	2,000	2,000	423
	RENOVATE DORMITORY	1,200	1,200	1,200	425

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
INDEX
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 1994
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)
INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

<u>STATE/COUNTRY</u> <u>INSTALLATION</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>PROJECT</u> <u>AUTH</u>	<u>AUTH</u> <u>FOR</u> <u>APPROP</u>	<u>APPROP</u> <u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
	<u>MEMPHIS NAS TOTAL:</u>	<u>6.200</u>	<u>6.200</u>	<u>6.200</u>	
	<u>TENNESSEE TOTAL:</u>	<u>7.700</u>	<u>7.700</u>	<u>7.700</u>	
TEXAS					
DYESS AFB					
	UPGRADE HYDRANT FUELING SYSTEM, PHASE II	9,500	9,500	9,500	428
	WEAPONS STORAGE AREA SECURITY	890	890	890	647
	<u>DYESS AFB TOTAL:</u>	<u>10.390</u>	<u>10.390</u>	<u>10.390</u>	
GOODFELLOW AFB					
	BASE ENGINEERING COMPLEX	3,700	3,700	3,700	432
	<u>GOODFELLOW AFB TOTAL:</u>	<u>3.700</u>	<u>3.700</u>	<u>3.700</u>	
KELLY AFB					
	UPGRADE TAXIWAY	3,550	3,550	3,550	437
	C-17 ENGINEERING TEST LABORATORY	2,600	2,600	2,600	440
	C-17 ADD/ALTER NONDESTRUCTIVE INSPECTION FACILITY (DBOF)	4,900	4,900	4,900	443
	C-17 ALTER DEPOT AVIONICS FACILITY (DBOF)	731	731	731	650
	ALTER WEAPON SYSTEMS SUPPORT CENTER, PHASE II (DBOF)	7,800	7,800	7,800	446
	ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES (DBOF)	2,000	2,000	2,000	449
	UPGRADE SANITARY SEWER MAINS, PHASE I	3,000	3,000	3,000	452
	UPGRADE STORM DRAINAGE SYSTEM, PHASE I	2,900	2,900	2,900	455
	<u>KELLY AFB TOTAL:</u>	<u>27.481</u>	<u>27.481</u>	<u>27.481</u>	
LACKLAND AFB					
	TRAINING SERVICES FACILITIES	5,800	5,800	5,800	459
	ALTER BASE SUPPORT FACILITY	5,400	5,400	5,400	462

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
INDEX
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 1994
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)
INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

<u>STATE/COUNTRY</u> <u>INSTALLATION</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>PROJECT</u> <u>AUTH</u>	<u>AUTH</u> <u>FOR</u> <u>APPROP</u>	<u>APPROP</u> <u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
	MISSION SUPPORT CENTER	7,543	7,543	7,543	465
	BASE CONTRACTING CENTER	2,450	2,450	2,450	468
	7-LEVEL TRAINING DORMITORY	8,900	8,900	8,900	470
	<u>LACKLAND AFB TOTAL:</u>	<u>30,093</u>	<u>30,093</u>	<u>30,093</u>	
LACKLAND ANNEX					
	VEHICLE MAINTENANCE FACILITY	1,200	1,200	1,200	474
	<u>LACKLAND ANNEX TOTAL:</u>	<u>1,200</u>	<u>1,200</u>	<u>1,200</u>	
LAUGHLIN AFB					
	UPGRADE AIRFIELD PAVEMENT	3,250	3,250	3,250	478
	FIRE STATION	2,400	2,400	2,400	481
	UPGRADE AIRFIELD LIGHTING	3,000	3,000	3,000	484
	<u>LAUGHLIN AFB TOTAL:</u>	<u>8,650</u>	<u>8,650</u>	<u>8,650</u>	
RANDOLPH AFB					
	CONTROL TOWER	2,800	2,800	2,800	488
	UPGRADE ELECTRICAL DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM	2,500	2,500	2,500	491
	<u>RANDOLPH AFB TOTAL:</u>	<u>5,300</u>	<u>5,300</u>	<u>5,300</u>	
REESE AFB					
	UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	900	900	900	653
	<u>REESE AFB TOTAL:</u>	<u>900</u>	<u>900</u>	<u>900</u>	
SHEPPARD AFB					
	ENJJPT ALTER FLIGHT TRAINING FACILITY	2,200	2,200	2,200	496
	FIRE TRAINING FACILITY	850	850	850	656
	7-LEVEL TRAINING DORMITORY	14,200	14,200	14,200	499
	ADD TO AND ALTER CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	780	780	780	659
	<u>SHEPPARD AFB TOTAL:</u>	<u>18,030</u>	<u>18,030</u>	<u>18,030</u>	

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
INDEX
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 1994
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)
INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

STATE/COUNTRY <u>INSTALLATION</u>	PROJECT	PROJECT AUTH	AUTH FOR APPROP	APPROP AMOUNT	<u>PAGE</u>
	<u>TEXAS TOTAL:</u>	<u>105,744</u>	<u>105,744</u>	<u>105,744</u>	
UTAH					
HILL AFB					
	FIRE TRAINING FACILITY (DBOF)	880	880	880	662
	UPGRADE INDUSTRIAL WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT (DBOF)	5,100	5,100	5,100	504
	UPGRADE WATER DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM	2,400	2,400	2,400	507
	<u>HILL AFB TOTAL:</u>	<u>8,380</u>	<u>8,380</u>	<u>8,380</u>	
	<u>UTAH TOTAL:</u>	<u>8,380</u>	<u>8,380</u>	<u>8,380</u>	
VIRGINIA					
LANGLEY AFB					
	FIRE STATION	3,850	3,850	3,850	511
	ADD TO AND ALTER CARS OPERATIONS FACILITY	5,373	5,373	5,373	514
	BASE ENGINEERING COMPLEX, PHASE II	4,000	4,000	4,000	517
	UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	500	500	500	665
	RESTORE KING STREET BRIDGE	4,100	4,100	4,100	520
	<u>LANGLEY AFB TOTAL:</u>	<u>17,823</u>	<u>17,823</u>	<u>17,823</u>	
	<u>VIRGINIA TOTAL:</u>	<u>17,823</u>	<u>17,823</u>	<u>17,823</u>	
WASHINGTON					
FAIRCHILD AFB					
	INTELLIGENCE TECHNICAL TRAINING FACILITY	3,500	3,500	3,500	524
	<u>FAIRCHILD AFB TOTAL:</u>	<u>3,500</u>	<u>3,500</u>	<u>3,500</u>	
MCCHORD AFB					
	ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES (DBOF)	6,500	6,500	6,500	528
	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER COMPLEX (DBOF)	4,400	4,400	4,400	531

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
INDEX
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 1994
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)
INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

<u>STATE/COUNTRY</u> <u>INSTALLATION</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>PROJECT</u> <u>AUTH</u>	<u>AUTH</u> <u>FOR</u> <u>APPROP</u>	<u>APPROP</u> <u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
	<u>MCCHORD AFB TOTAL:</u>	<u>10.900</u>	<u>10.900</u>	<u>10.900</u>	
	<u>WASHINGTON TOTAL:</u>	<u>14.400</u>	<u>14.400</u>	<u>14.400</u>	
 WYOMING					
F E WARREN AFB					
	RENOVATE SECURITY POLICE OPERATIONS	6,000	6,000	6,000	535
	REMOTE MISSILE CREW FACILITIES	3,800	3,800	3,800	538
	UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS, PHASE I	2,200	2,200	2,200	541
	WEAPONS STORAGE AREA SECURITY	640	640	640	668
	<u>F E WARREN AFB TOTAL:</u>	<u>12.640</u>	<u>12.640</u>	<u>12.640</u>	
	<u>WYOMING TOTAL:</u>	<u>12.640</u>	<u>12.640</u>	<u>12.640</u>	
	<u>INSIDE THE UNITED STATES TOTAL:</u>	<u>729.152</u>	<u>793.302</u>	<u>802.502</u>	

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
INDEX
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 1994
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)
OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

STATE/COUNTRY <u>INSTALLATION</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>	PROJECT <u>AUTH</u>	AUTH FOR <u>APPROP</u>	<u>APPROP</u> <u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
ANTIGUA					
ANTIGUA AS					
	SLFI-UPGRADE BACKUP GENERATOR	1,000	1,000	1,000	671
	<u>ANTIGUA AS TOTAL:</u>	<u>1,000</u>	<u>1,000</u>	<u>1,000</u>	
	<u>ANTIGUA TOTAL:</u>	<u>1,000</u>	<u>1,000</u>	<u>1,000</u>	
ASCENSION ISLAND					
ASCENSION AAF					
	WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT	3,400	3,400	3,400	546
	<u>ASCENSION AAF TOTAL:</u>	<u>3,400</u>	<u>3,400</u>	<u>3,400</u>	
	<u>ASCENSION ISLAND TOTAL:</u>	<u>3,400</u>	<u>3,400</u>	<u>3,400</u>	
CLASSIFIED LOCATIONS					
CLASSIFIED LOCATIONS					
	WAR READINESS MATERIEL WAREHOUSE	5,500	5,500	5,500	550
	<u>CLASSIFIED LOCATIONS TOTAL:</u>	<u>5,500</u>	<u>5,500</u>	<u>5,500</u>	
	<u>CLASSIFIED LOCATIONS TOTAL:</u>	<u>5,500</u>	<u>5,500</u>	<u>5,500</u>	
GERMANY					
RAMSTEIN AB					
	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	3,100	3,100	3,100	553
	<u>RAMSTEIN AB TOTAL:</u>	<u>3,100</u>	<u>3,100</u>	<u>3,100</u>	
	<u>GERMANY TOTAL:</u>	<u>3,100</u>	<u>3,100</u>	<u>3,100</u>	
GREENLAND					
THULE AB					
	WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT	5,492	5,492	5,492	557
	<u>THULE AB TOTAL:</u>	<u>5,492</u>	<u>5,492</u>	<u>5,492</u>	
	<u>GREENLAND TOTAL:</u>	<u>5,492</u>	<u>5,492</u>	<u>5,492</u>	

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
INDEX
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 1994
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)
OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

<u>STATE/COUNTRY</u> <u>INSTALLATION</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>PROJECT</u> <u>AUTH</u>	<u>AUTH</u> <u>FOR</u> <u>APPROP</u>	<u>APPROP</u> <u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
GUAM					
ANDERSEN AFB					
	UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	4,100	4,100	4,100	560
	<u>ANDERSEN AFB TOTAL:</u>	<u>4,100</u>	<u>4,100</u>	<u>4,100</u>	
	<u>GUAM TOTAL:</u>	<u>4,100</u>	<u>4,100</u>	<u>4,100</u>	
INDIAN OCEAN					
DIEGO GARCIA AB					
	GPS INSTRUMENTATION FACILITY	1,700	1,700	1,700	564
	SATELLITE TRACKING STORAGE FACILITY	560	560	560	674
	<u>DIEGO GARCIA AB TOTAL:</u>	<u>2,260</u>	<u>2,260</u>	<u>2,260</u>	
	<u>INDIAN OCEAN TOTAL:</u>	<u>2,260</u>	<u>2,260</u>	<u>2,260</u>	
OMAN					
THUMRAIT AB					
	WAR READINESS MATERIEL COVERED STORAGE FACILITY	1,800	1,800	1,800	568
	<u>THUMRAIT AB TOTAL:</u>	<u>1,800</u>	<u>1,800</u>	<u>1,800</u>	
	<u>OMAN TOTAL:</u>	<u>1,800</u>	<u>1,800</u>	<u>1,800</u>	
TURKEY					
INCIRLIK AB					
	ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES	2,400	2,400	2,400	571
	<u>INCIRLIK AB TOTAL:</u>	<u>2,400</u>	<u>2,400</u>	<u>2,400</u>	
	<u>TURKEY TOTAL:</u>	<u>2,400</u>	<u>2,400</u>	<u>2,400</u>	
UNITED KINGDOM					
RAF MILDENHALL					
	NAVAL AIR FACILITY	4,800	4,800	4,800	575
	<u>RAF MILDENHALL TOTAL:</u>	<u>4,800</u>	<u>4,800</u>	<u>4,800</u>	
	<u>UNITED KINGDOM TOTAL:</u>	<u>4,800</u>	<u>4,800</u>	<u>4,800</u>	

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
INDEX
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 1994
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)
OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

<u>STATE/COUNTRY</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>AUTH</u>	<u>FOR</u>	<u>APPROP</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
<u>INSTALLATION</u>		<u>AUTH</u>	<u>APPROP</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>		
<u>OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES TOTAL:</u>		<u>33,852</u>	<u>33,852</u>	<u>33,852</u>		

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
INDEX
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 1994
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)
WORLDWIDE

<u>STATE/COUNTRY</u> <u>INSTALLATION</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>PROJECT</u> <u>AUTH</u>	<u>AUTH</u> <u>FOR</u> <u>APPROP</u>	<u>APPROP</u> <u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
VARIOUS VARIOUS LOCATIONS					
	PLANNING & DESIGN	0	63,180	63,180	578
	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	0	6,844	6,844	580
	<u>VARIOUS LOCATIONS TOTAL:</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>70,024</u>	<u>70,024</u>	
	<u>VARIOUS TOTAL:</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>70,024</u>	<u>70,024</u>	
	<u>WORLDWIDE TOTAL:</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>70,024</u>	<u>70,024</u>	
	<u>FY 94 TOTAL:</u>	<u>763,004</u>	<u>897,178</u>	<u>906,378</u>	

DEFINITIONS OF NEW AND CURRENT MISSION

NEW MISSION PROJECTS - These projects support the deployment and beddown of new weapons systems, new or additional aircraft, missile, and space programs and support of new equipment such as radars, communications, computers, satellite tracking and electronic security. New mission projects all support new programs and initiatives that do not revitalize the existing physical plant. The projects support new and additional requirements. Planning and design and minor construction are also included in this category.

CURRENT MISSION PROJECTS - These projects revitalize the existing facility plant by replacement or upgrading existing facilities and by alleviating long standing deficiencies not generated by new missions or equipment. Included are projects to improve the quality of life, upgrade the workplace and projects to increase productivity and achieve compliance with environmental, health and safety standards.

<u>FY 94</u>	<u>(\$000)</u>
NEW MISSION	\$312,863
CURRENT MISSION	\$593,515
TOTAL	\$906,378

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 1994
CURRENT MISSION, NEW MISSION AND
WORLDWIDE
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)
INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

<u>STATE/COUNTRY</u> <u>INSTALLATION</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>APPROP</u> <u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>TYPE</u>
ALABAMA			
GUNTER ANNEX			
	HAZARDOUS WASTE ACCUMULATION FACILITY	310	CM
	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	2,700	CM
	EMERGENCY POWER GENERATOR PLANT	1,200	NM
	SPILL CONTAINMENT CONTROLS	470	CM
	GUNTER ANNEX TOTAL:	4,680	
MAXWELL AFB			
	EXTEND RUNWAY/UPGRADE	9,200	CM
	TAXIWAY/RAMP	3,800	CM
	AIR FORCE QUALITY CENTER	4,650	CM
	UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	1,700	CM
	SPILL CONTAINMENT CONTROLS	970	CM
	UPGRADE UTILITY SYSTEMS, PHASE I	5,050	CM
	MAXWELL AFB TOTAL:	25,370	
	ALABAMA TOTAL:	30,050	
ALASKA			
CAPE ROMANZOF LRRS			
	REPLACE TRAMWAY SYSTEM	3,350	CM
	CAPE ROMANZOF LRRS TOTAL:	3,350	
EIELSON AFB			
	FIRE TRAINING FACILITY	2,400	CM
	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	5,400	CM
	EIELSON AFB TOTAL:	7,800	

Legend: CM - Current Mission
NM - New Mission

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 1994
CURRENT MISSION, NEW MISSION AND
WORLDWIDE
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)
INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

<u>STATE/COUNTRY</u> <u>INSTALLATION</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>APPROP</u> <u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>TYPE</u>
ELMENDORF AFB			
	CORROSION CONTROL FACILITY	5,975	CM
	MUNITIONS MAINTENANCE FACILITY	2,100	NM
	MUNITIONS EQUIPMENT FACILITY	1,860	NM
	HAZARDOUS WASTE STORAGE FACILITY	3,900	CM
	DINING FACILITY	6,800	CM
	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	5,070	CM
	ADD TO SANITARY SEWER SYSTEM	5,100	CM
	ELMENDORF AFB TOTAL:	30,805	
	ALASKA TOTAL:	41,955	
ARIZONA			
DAVIS-MONTHAN AFB			
	UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	650	CM
	DAVIS-MONTHAN AFB TOTAL:	650	
LUKE AFB			
	FIRE TRAINING FACILITY	800	CM
	UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	1,250	CM
	DINING FACILITY	4,700	CM
	LUKE AFB TOTAL:	6,750	
NAVAJO ARMY DEPOT			
	ALTER MINUTEMAN II STORAGE FACILITIES	7,250	NM
	NAVAJO ARMY DEPOT TOTAL:	7,250	
	ARIZONA TOTAL:	14,650	

Legend: CM - Current Mission
NM - New Mission

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 1994
CURRENT MISSION, NEW MISSION AND
WORLDWIDE
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)
INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

<u>STATE/COUNTRY</u> <u>INSTALLATION</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>APPROP</u> <u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>TYPE</u>
ARKANSAS			
LITTLE ROCK AFB			
	ALTER JRTC OPERATIONS CENTER	1,050	NM
	ADD/ALTER ENGINE INSPECTION AND REPAIR SHOP (DBOF)	1,200	CM
	ADD TO AND ALTER CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER (DBOF)	2,250	CM
	LITTLE ROCK AFB TOTAL:	4,500	
	ARKANSAS TOTAL:	4,500	
CALIFORNIA			
EDWARDS AFB			
	UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS, PHASE II	5,400	CM
	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	5,900	CM
	EDWARDS AFB TOTAL:	11,300	
MCCLELLAN AFB			
	FIRE PROTECTION AIRCRAFT FACILITIES (DBOF)	1,900	CM
	MCCLELLAN AFB TOTAL:	1,900	
TRAVIS AFB			
	AIRCRAFT GENERAL PURPOSE MAINTENANCE SHOP	11,200	CM
	UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS (DBOF)	2,840	CM
	TRAVIS AFB TOTAL:	14,040	
VANDENBERG AFB			
	SLFI-TPQ-18 RADAR FACILITY	2,408	CM
	HAPDWARE STORAGE FACILITY	3,500	NM
	UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	1,700	CM

Legend: CM - Current Mission
NM - New Mission

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 1994
 CURRENT MISSION, NEW MISSION AND
 WORLDWIDE
 (DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)
 INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

<u>STATE/COUNTRY</u> <u>INSTALLATION</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>APPROP</u> <u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>TYPE</u>
	SLFI-UPGRADE ELECTRICAL SYSTEM	11,520	CM
	SLFI-UPGRADE FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM	1,600	CM
	VANDENBERG AFB TOTAL:	20,728	
	CALIFORNIA TOTAL:	47,968	
CLASSIFIED LOCATIONS			
CLASSIFIED LOCATIONS			
	SPECIAL TACTICAL UNIT DETACHMENT FACILITY	5,540	NM
	OMEGA FACILITIES	2,600	NM
	CLASSIFIED LOCATIONS TOTAL:	8,140	
	CLASSIFIED LOCATIONS TOTAL:	8,140	
COLORADO			
BUCKLEY ANGB			
	COMMUNICATION DATA PROCESSING FACILITY	39,000	NM
	BUCKLEY ANGB TOTAL:	39,000	
CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN AFB			
	UPGRADE ELECTRICAL SERVICE	4,450	CM
	CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN AFB TOTAL:	4,450	
PETERSON AFB			
	ADD TO AND ALTER INTEGRATION SUPPORT FACILITY, PHASE II	16,400	NM
	PRECISION MEASUREMENT EQUIPMENT LABORATORY	2,200	NM
	TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT FACILITY	2,430	CM
	PETERSON AFB TOTAL:	21,030	

Legend: CM - Current Mission
 NM - New Mission

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 1994
CURRENT MISSION, NEW MISSION AND
WORLDWIDE
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)
INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

<u>STATE/COUNTRY</u> <u>INSTALLATION</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>APPROP</u> <u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>TYPE</u>
USAF ACADEMY			
	ENHANCED FLIGHT SCREENER HANGARS	3,800	NM
	UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	780	CM
	ADD TO AND ALTER WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT	7,100	CM
	USAF ACADEMY TOTAL:	11,680	
	COLORADO TOTAL:	76,160	
DELAWARE			
DOVER AFB			
	INSTALL EMISSION CONTROL DEVICES	860	CM
	DORMITORY (DBOF)	3,200	CM
	ADD TO AND ALTER DINING FACILITY (DBOF)	2,500	CM
	DOVER AFB TOTAL:	6,560	
	DELAWARE TOTAL:	6,560	
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA			
BOLLING AFB			
	ADD TO CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	2,000	CM
	BOLLING AFB TOTAL:	2,000	
	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TOTAL:	2,000	
FLORIDA			
CAPE CANAVERAL AFS			
	UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	400	CM
	SLFI-BACKUP POWER	2,500	CM
	SLFI-BACKUP POWER	800	CM

Legend: CM - Current Mission
NM - New Mission

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 1994
CURRENT MISSION, NEW MISSION AND
WORLDWIDE
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)
INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

<u>STATE/COUNTRY</u> <u>INSTALLATION</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>APPROP</u> <u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>TYPE</u>
	SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT	11,900	CM
	SLFI-UPGRADE WATER SUPPLY MAINS	1,200	CM
	SLFI-UPGRADE FIRE SYSTEM	2,400	CM
	CAPE CANAVERAL AFS TOTAL:	19,200	
EGLIN AFB			
	UPGRADE HYDRANT FUELING SYSTEM	4,550	CM
	REPLACE POL PIPELINE	3,300	CM
	AIRCRAFT ENGINE TEST FACILITY	1,600	CM
	VEHICLE MAINTENANCE/WAREHOUSE FACILITIES	2,600	CM
	RENOVATE CLIMATIC TEST CHAMBER, PHASE II	57,000	CM
	EGLIN AFB TOTAL:	69,050	
EGLIN AUXILIARY 9			
	ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES	4,479	CM
	UPGRADE SANITARY SEWAGE SYSTEM	1,750	CM
	UPGRADE STORM SEWAGE SYSTEM	1,600	CM
	EGLIN AUXILIARY 9 TOTAL:	7,829	
PATRICK AFB			
	ALTER MAINTENANCE HANGAR	2,000	NM
	UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	1,850	CM
	PATRICK AFB TOTAL:	3,850	
TYNDALL AFB			
	BASE SUPPLY LOGISTICS CENTER	2,600	CM
	TYNDALL AFB TOTAL:	2,600	
	FLORIDA TOTAL:	102,529	

Legend: CM - Current Mission
NM - New Mission

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 1994
 CURRENT MISSION, NEW MISSION AND
 WORLDWIDE
 (DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)
 INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

<u>STATE/COUNTRY</u> <u>INSTALLATION</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>APPROP</u> <u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>TYPE</u>
GEORGIA			
ROBINS AFB			
	J-STARS ADD TO AND ALTER OPERATIONS COMPLEX	4,100	NM
	J-STARS SQUADRON OPERATIONS/ AMU	7,500	NM
	J-STARS ADD TO AND ALTER MAINTENANCE COMPLEX	9,300	NM
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT PAINT FACILITY	970	CM
	ADD TO AND ALTER LOGISTICAL SYSTEMS OPERATIONS CENTER	3,000	CM
	ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES (DBOF)	4,300	CM
	J-STARS ADD TO AND ALTER UTILITIES	3,500	NM
	UPGRADE INDUSTRIAL WASTEWATER TREATMENT AND DISPOSAL PLANTS	10,700	CM
	ROBINS AFB TOTAL:	43,370	
	GEORGIA TOTAL:	43,370	
HAWAII			
HICKAM AFB			
	MILSTAR COMMUNICATIONS GROUND TERMINAL	2,200	NM
	UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	2,100	CM
	DORMITORY	5,950	CM
	HICKAM AFB TOTAL:	10,250	
KAENA POINT STS			
	POWER PLANT	7,350	CM
	KAENA POINT STS TOTAL:	7,350	
	HAWAII TOTAL:	17,600	

Legend: CM - Current Mission
 NM - New Mission

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 1994
 CURRENT MISSION, NEW MISSION AND
 WORLDWIDE
 (DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)
 INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

<u>STATE/COUNTRY</u> <u>INSTALLATION</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>APPROP</u> <u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>TYPE</u>
ILLINOIS			
SCOTT AFB			
	INTEROPERABILITY TEST AND TRAINING FACILITY	5,000	CM
	MUNITIONS STORAGE FACILITY/ LAND ACQUISITION (DBOF)	2,450	CM
	SCOTT AFB TOTAL:	7,450	
	ILLINOIS TOTAL:	7,450	
KANSAS			
MCCONNELL AFB			
	CONTROL TOWER CAB	900	CM
	LAND RESTRICTIVE EASEMENT ACQUISITION	1,000	CM
	MCCONNELL AFB TOTAL:	1,900	
	KANSAS TOTAL:	1,900	
LOUISIANA			
BARKSDALE AFB			
	UPGRADE BULK STORAGE BASINS	1,600	CM
	WEAPONS STORAGE AREA SECURITY	960	CM
	BARKSDALE AFB TOTAL:	2,560	
	LOUISIANA TOTAL:	2,560	
MARYLAND			
ANDREWS AFB			
	AIR FREIGHT TERMINAL (DBOF)	4,400	CM
	FIRE TRAINING FACILITY (DBOF)	1,000	CM
	UPGRADE COMPOSITE ADMINISTRATION FACILITY (DBOF)	9,940	CM

Legend: CM - Current Mission
 NM - New Mission

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 1994
CURRENT MISSION, NEW MISSION AND
WORLDWIDE
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)
INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

<u>STATE/COUNTRY</u> <u>INSTALLATION</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>APPROP</u> <u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>TYPE</u>
	UPGRADE SANITARY SEWER SYSTEMS	2,650	CM
	ANDREWS AFB TOTAL:	17,990	
FORT GEORGE G. MEADE			
	ADD TO OPERATIONS FACILITY	1,450	NM
	FORT GEORGE G. MEADE TOTAL:	1,450	
	MARYLAND TOTAL:	19,440	
MISSISSIPPI			
COLUMBUS AFB			
	UPGRADE AIRFIELD LIGHTING	2,900	CM
	COLUMBUS AFB TOTAL:	2,900	
KEESLER AFB			
	FIRE TRAINING FACILITY	690	CM
	UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	600	CM
	UPGRADE STUDENT DORMITORY	4,500	CM
	UPGRADE SANITARY SEWER SYSTEM	2,920	CM
	KEESLER AFB TOTAL:	8,710	
	MISSISSIPPI TOTAL:	11,610	
MISSOURI			
WHITEMAN AFB			
	B-2 AIRCRAFT APRON/TAXIWAY UPGRADE	3,400	NM
	B-2 HYDRANT FUEL LOOP II, PHASE II	2,700	NM
	B-2 AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE DOCKS	14,500	NM
	B-2 VEHICLE MAINTENANCE FACILITY	1,700	NM
	B-2 ADD TO AND ALTER MUNITIONS STORAGE FACILITIES	3,338	NM

Legend: CM - Current Mission
NM - New Mission

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 1994
 CURRENT MISSION, NEW MISSION AND
 WORLDWIDE
 (DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)
 INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

<u>STATE/COUNTRY</u> <u>INSTALLATION</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>APPROP</u> <u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>TYPE</u>
	B-2 UTILITY UPGRADE	4,850	NM
	B-2 UPGRADE BASE ROADS, PHASE I	5,900	NM
	B-2 DEFENSE ACCESS ROADS	7,150	NM
	WHITEMAN AFB TOTAL:	43,538	
	MISSOURI TOTAL:	43,538	
MONTANA			
MALMSTROM AFB			
	BASE ENGINEERING COMPLEX (DBOF)	6,200	CM
	UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS MINUTEMAN II FACILITIES	1,500	CM
	MALMSTROM AFB TOTAL:	7,700	
	MONTANA TOTAL:	7,700	
NEBRASKA			
OFFUTT AFB			
	REPAIR AIRFIELD PAVEMENTS AND LIGHTING	8,700	CM
	ADD TO EMERGENCY BACK-UP POWER	2,300	CM
	OFFUTT AFB TOTAL:	11,000	
	NEBRASKA TOTAL:	11,000	
NEVADA			
NELLIS AFB			
	UPGRADE POL TANKS	1,650	CM
	NELLIS AFB TOTAL:	1,650	
	NEVADA TOTAL:	1,650	

Legend: CM - Current Mission
 NM - New Mission

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 1994
 CURRENT MISSION, NEW MISSION AND
 WORLDWIDE
 (DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)
 INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

<u>STATE/COUNTRY</u> <u>INSTALLATION</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>APPROP</u> <u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>TYPE</u>
NEW MEXICO			
CANNON AFB			
	SOUND SUPPRESSOR SUPPORT PAD	665	CM
	FIRE TRAINING FACILITY	1,000	CM
	UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	1,100	CM
	BASE ENGINEERING COMPLEX	6,150	CM
	CANNON AFB TOTAL:	8,915	
HOLLOMAN AFB			
	UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	1,000	CM
	ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES	6,400	CM
	SEWER EFFLUENT SYSTEM	1,800	CM
	HOLLOMAN AFB TOTAL:	9,200	
KIRTLAND AFB			
	AEROSPACE ENGINEERING FACILITY	3,167	NM
	COMPOSITE MATERIALS LABORATORY	5,750	NM
	SPACE STRUCTURES LABORATORY	6,200	NM
	ALTER DORMITORY	5,100	CM
	UPGRADE ELECTRICAL DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM	6,844	CM
	KIRTLAND AFB TOTAL:	27,061	
	NEW MEXICO TOTAL:	45,176	
NORTH CAROLINA			
POPE AFB			
	ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES	4,300	CM
	DINING FACILITY	4,300	CM
	POPE AFB TOTAL:	8,600	

Legend: CM - Current Mission
 NM - New Mission

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 1994
CURRENT MISSION, NEW MISSION AND
WORLDWIDE
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)
INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

<u>STATE/COUNTRY</u> <u>INSTALLATION</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>APPROP</u> <u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>TYPE</u>
SEYMOUR-JOHNSON AFB			
	MUNITIONS MAINTENANCE SUPPORT FACILITY	480	CM
	ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES	4,900	CM
	SEYMOUR-JOHNSON AFB TOTAL:	5,380	
	NORTH CAROLINA TOTAL:	13,990	
NORTH DAKOTA			
GRAND FORKS AFB			
	UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	2,600	CM
	GRAND FORKS AFB TOTAL:	2,600	
MINOT AFB			
	UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	2,000	CM
	MINOT AFB TOTAL:	2,000	
	NORTH DAKOTA TOTAL:	4,600	
OHIO			
WRIGHT-PATTERSON AFB			
	ADD TO AVIONICS RESEARCH LABORATORY, PHASE II	5,650	CM
	ADD TO AND ALTER ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT COMPLEX, PHASE II	12,850	CM
	SEAL FUEL CONTAINMENT DIKES	1,500	CM
	UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS, PHASE II	3,200	CM
	RENOVATE ELECTRIC SUBSTATIONS	4,450	CM
	WRIGHT-PATTERSON AFB TOTAL:	27,650	
	OHIO TOTAL:	27,650	

Legend: CM - Current Mission
NM - New Mission

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 1994
 CURRENT MISSION, NEW MISSION AND
 WORLDWIDE
 (DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)
 INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

<u>STATE/COUNTRY</u> <u>INSTALLATION</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>APPROP</u> <u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>TYPE</u>
OKLAHOMA			
ALTUS AFB			
	C-17 FIRE STATION (DBOF)	780	NM
	C-17 ADD TO FLIGHT SIMULATION TRAINING FACILITY, PHII (DBOF)	2,850	NM
	C-17 ADD TO AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE FACILITY (DBOF)	3,300	NM
	ALTUS AFB TOTAL:	6,930	
TINKER AFB			
	ALTER HYDRANT FUELING SYSTEM	4,129	CM
	MILSTAR COMMUNICATIONS GROUND TERMINAL	800	NM
	SEAL FUEL CONTAINMENT DIKES	620	CM
	UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	4,700	CM
	ENGINEERING AND CONTRACT SUPPORT FACILITY	5,900	CM
	INDUSTRIAL WASTEWATER REGIONAL CONNECTION (DBOF)	5,400	CM
	TINKER AFB TOTAL:	21,549	
VANCE AFB			
	UPGRADE AIRFIELD LIGHTING	3,300	CM
	T-1 SPECIALIZED UPT MAINTENANCE SUPPORT	2,700	NM
	VANCE AFB TOTAL:	6,000	
	OKLAHOMA TOTAL:	34,479	
SOUTH CAROLINA			
CHARLESTON AFB			
	FIRE TRAINING FACILITY (DBOF)	1,100	CM
	CHARLESTON AFB TOTAL:	1,100	

Legend: CM - Current Mission
 NM - New Mission

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 1994
CURRENT MISSION, NEW MISSION AND
WORLDWIDE
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)
INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

<u>STATE/COUNTRY</u> <u>INSTALLATION</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>APPROP</u> <u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>TYPE</u>
SHAW AFB			
	CONTROL TOWER	2,700	CM
	UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	520	CM
	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	2,650	CM
	SHAW AFB TOTAL:	5,870	
	SOUTH CAROLINA TOTAL:	6,970	
SOUTH DAKOTA			
ELLSWORTH AFB			
	ALTER AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE DOCK	630	CM
	ELLSWORTH AFB TOTAL:	630	
	SOUTH DAKOTA TOTAL:	630	
TENNESSEE			
ARNOLD AFB			
	UPGRADE SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT	1,500	CM
	ARNOLD AFB TOTAL:	1,500	
MEMPHIS NAS			
	ADD TO AND ALTER HIGH-BAY TECHNICAL TRAINING FACILITY	3,000	NM
	ALTER TECHNICAL TRAINING FACILITY	2,000	NM
	RENOVATE DORMITORY	1,200	NM
	MEMPHIS NAS TOTAL:	6,200	
	TENNESSEE TOTAL:	7,700	
TEXAS			
DYESS AFB			
	UPGRADE HYDRANT FUELING SYSTEM, PHASE II	9,500	CM

Legend: CM - Current Mission
NM - New Mission

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 1994
CURRENT MISSION, NEW MISSION AND
WORLDWIDE
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)
INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

<u>STATE/COUNTRY</u> <u>INSTALLATION</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>APPROP</u> <u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>TYPE</u>
	WEAPONS STORAGE AREA SECURITY	890	CM
	DYESS AFB TOTAL:	10,390	
GOODFELLOW AFB			
	BASE ENGINEERING COMPLEX	3,700	CM
	GOODFELLOW AFB TOTAL:	3,700	
KELLY AFB			
	UPGRADE TAXIWAY	3,550	CM
	C-17 ENGINEERING TEST LABORATORY	2,600	NM
	C-17 ADD/ALTER NONDESTRUCTIVE INSPECTION FACILITY (DBOF)	4,900	NM
	C-17 ALTER DEPOT AVIONICS FACILITY (DBOF)	731	NM
	ALTER WEAPON SYSTEMS SUPPORT CENTER, PHASE II (DBOF)	7,800	CM
	ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES (DBOF)	2,000	CM
	UPGRADE SANITARY SEWER MAINS, PHASE I	3,000	CM
	UPGRADE STORM DRAINAGE SYSTEM, PHASE I	2,900	CM
	KELLY AFB TOTAL:	27,481	
LACKLAND AFB			
	TRAINING SERVICES FACILITIES	5,800	CM
	ALTER BASE SUPPORT FACILITY	5,400	CM
	MISSION SUPPORT CENTER	7,543	CM
	BASE CONTRACTING CENTER	2,450	CM
	7-LEVEL TRAINING DORMITORY	8,900	NM
	LACKLAND AFB TOTAL:	30,093	

Legend: CM - Current Mission
NM - New Mission

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 1994
 CURRENT MISSION, NEW MISSION AND
 WORLDWIDE
 (DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)
 INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

<u>STATE/COUNTRY</u> <u>INSTALLATION</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>APPROP</u> <u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>TYPE</u>
LACKLAND ANNEX			
	VEHICLE MAINTENANCE FACILITY	1,200	CM
	LACKLAND ANNEX TOTAL:	1,200	
LAUGHLIN AFB			
	UPGRADE AIRFIELD PAVEMENT	3,250	CM
	FIRE STATION	2,400	CM
	UPGRADE AIRFIELD LIGHTING	3,000	CM
	LAUGHLIN AFB TOTAL:	8,650	
RANDOLPH AFB			
	CONTROL TOWER	2,800	CM
	UPGRADE ELECTRICAL DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM	2,500	CM
	RANDOLPH AFB TOTAL:	5,300	
REESE AFB			
	UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	900	CM
	REESE AFB TOTAL:	900	
SHEPPARD AFB			
	ENJJPT ALTER FLIGHT TRAINING FACILITY	2,200	NM
	FIRE TRAINING FACILITY	850	CM
	7-LEVEL TRAINING DORMITORY	14,200	NM
	ADD TO AND ALTER CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	780	CM
	SHEPPARD AFB TOTAL:	18,030	
	TEXAS TOTAL:	105,744	

Legend: CM - Current Mission
 NM - New Mission

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 1994
CURRENT MISSION, NEW MISSION AND
WORLDWIDE
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)
INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

<u>STATE/COUNTRY</u> <u>INSTALLATION</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>APPROP</u> <u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>TYPE</u>
UTAH			
HILL AFB			
	FIRE TRAINING FACILITY (DBOF)	880	CM
	UPGRADE INDUSTRIAL WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT (DBOF)	5,100	CM
	UPGRADE WATER DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM	2,400	CM
	HILL AFB TOTAL:	8,380	
	UTAH TOTAL:	8,380	
VIRGINIA			
LANGLEY AFB			
	FIRE STATION	3,850	CM
	ADD TO AND ALTER CARS OPERATIONS FACILITY	5,373	NM
	BASE ENGINEERING COMPLEX, PHASE II	4,000	CM
	UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	500	CM
	RESTORE KING STREET BRIDGE	4,100	CM
	LANGLEY AFB TOTAL:	17,823	
	VIRGINIA TOTAL:	17,823	
WASHINGTON			
FAIRCHILD AFB			
	INTELLIGENCE TECHNICAL TRAINING FACILITY	3,500	CM
	FAIRCHILD AFB TOTAL:	3,500	
MCCHORD AFB			
	ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES (DBOF)	6,500	CM

Legend: CM - Current Mission
NM - New Mission

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 1994
 CURRENT MISSION, NEW MISSION AND
 WORLDWIDE
 (DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)
 INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

<u>STATE/COUNTRY</u> <u>INSTALLATION</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>APPROP</u> <u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>TYPE</u>
	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER COMPLEX (DBOF)	4,400	CM
	MCCHORD AFB TOTAL:	10,900	
	WASHINGTON TOTAL:	14,400	
 WYOMING			
F E WARREN AFB			
	RENOVATE SECURITY POLICE OPERATIONS	6,000	CM
	REMOTE MISSILE CREW FACILITIES	3,800	CM
	UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS, PHASE I	2,200	CM
	WEAPONS STORAGE AREA SECURITY	640	CM
	F E WARREN AFB TOTAL:	12,640	
	WYOMING TOTAL:	12,640	
	INSIDE THE UNITED STATES TOTAL:	802,502	
 ANTIGUA			
ANTIGUA AS			
	SLFI-UPGRADE BACKUP GENERATOR	1,000	CM
	ANTIGUA AS TOTAL:	1,000	
	ANTIGUA TOTAL:	1,000	
 ASCENSION ISLAND			
ASCENSION AAF			
	WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT	3,400	CM
	ASCENSION AAF TOTAL:	3,400	
	ASCENSION ISLAND TOTAL:	3,400	

Legend: CM - Current Mission
 NM - New Mission

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 1994
CURRENT MISSION, NEW MISSION AND
WORLDWIDE
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)
OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

<u>STATE/COUNTRY</u> <u>INSTALLATION</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>APPROP</u> <u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>TYPE</u>
CLASSIFIED LOCATIONS			
CLASSIFIED LOCATIONS			
	WAR READINESS MATERIEL WAREHOUSE	5,500	NM
	CLASSIFIED LOCATIONS TOTAL:	5,500	
	CLASSIFIED LOCATIONS TOTAL:	5,500	
GERMANY			
RAMSTEIN AB			
	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	3,100	CM
	RAMSTEIN AB TOTAL:	3,100	
	GERMANY TOTAL:	3,100	
GREENLAND			
THULE AB			
	WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT	5,492	CM
	THULE AB TOTAL:	5,492	
	GREENLAND TOTAL:	5,492	
GUAM			
ANDERSEN AFB			
	UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	4,100	CM
	ANDERSEN AFB TOTAL:	4,100	
	GUAM TOTAL:	4,100	
INDIAN OCEAN			
DIEGO GARCIA AB			
	GPS INSTRUMENTATION FACILITY	1,700	CM

Legend: CM - Current Mission
NM - New Mission

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 1994
 CURRENT MISSION, NEW MISSION AND
 WORLDWIDE
 (DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)
 OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

<u>STATE/COUNTRY</u> <u>INSTALLATION</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>APPROP</u> <u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>TYPE</u>
	SATELLITE TRACKING STORAGE FACILITY	560	CM
	DIEGO GARCIA AB TOTAL:	2,260	
	INDIAN OCEAN TOTAL:	2,260	
OMAN			
THUMRAIT AB			
	WAR READINESS MATERIEL COVERED STORAGE FACILITY	1,800	NM
	THUMRAIT AB TOTAL:	1,800	
	OMAN TOTAL:	1,800	
TURKEY			
INCIRLIK AB			
	ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES	2,400	CM
	INCIRLIK AB TOTAL:	2,400	
	TURKEY TOTAL:	2,400	
UNITED KINGDOM			
RAF MILDENHALL			
	NAVAL AIR FACILITY	4,800	NM
	RAF MILDENHALL TOTAL:	4,800	
	UNITED KINGDOM TOTAL:	4,800	
	OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES TOTAL:	33,852	
VARIOUS			
VARIOUS LOCATIONS			
	PLANNING & DESIGN	63,180	NM

Legend: CM - Current Mission
 NM - New Mission

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 1994
CURRENT MISSION, NEW MISSION AND
WORLDWIDE
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)
WORLDWIDE

<u>STATE/COUNTRY</u> <u>INSTALLATION</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>APPROP</u> <u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>TYPE</u>
	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	6,844	NM
	VARIOUS LOCATIONS TOTAL:	70,024	
	VARIOUS TOTAL:	70,024	
	WORLDWIDE TOTAL:	70,024	
	FY 94 PROGRAM TOTAL:	906,378	

Legend: CM - Current Mission
NM - New Mission

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM
FY 1994 PRESIDENT'S BUDGET
INSTALLATION INDEX

<u>INSTALLATION</u>	<u>HOST COMMAND</u>	<u>STATE/COUNTRY</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
ALTUS AFB	AMC	OKLAHOMA	376
ANDERSEN AFB	PAF	GUAM	559
ANDREWS AFB	AMC	MARYLAND	242
ANTIGUA AAF	SPC	ANTIGUA	544
ARNOLD AFB	MTC	TENNESSEE	416
ASCENSION AAF	SPC	ASCENSION ISLAND	545
BARKSDALE AFB	ACC	LOUISIANA	238
BOLLING AFB	ADW	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	141
BUCKLEY ANGB	NGB	COLORADO	111
CANNON AFB	ACC	NEW MEXICO	311
CAPE CANAVERAL AFS	SPC	FLORIDA	145
CAPE ROMANZOF LRRS	PAF	ALASKA	20
CHARLESTON AFB	AMC	SOUTH CAROLINA	404
CHEYENNE MT AFB	SPC	COLORADO	112
CLASSIFIED LOCATIONS	LEE	INSIDE THE U.S.	108
CLASSIFIED LOCATIONS	LEE	OUTSIDE THE U.S.	549
COLUMBUS AFB	ATC	MISSISSIPPI	256
DAVIS-MONTHAN AFB	ACC	ARIZONA	53
DIEGO GARCIA AB	PAF	INDIAN OCEAN	563
DOVER AFB	AMC	DELAWARE	134
DYESS AFB	ACC	TEXAS	427
EDWARDS AFB	MTC	CALIFORNIA	74
EGLIN AFB	MTC	FLORIDA	159
EGLIN AUXILIARY #9	AMC	FLORIDA	175
EIELSON AFB	PAF	ALASKA	24
ELLSWORTH AFB	ACC	SOUTH DAKOTA	415
ELMENDORF AFB	PAF	ALASKA	31
F.E. WARREN AFB	ACC	WYOMING	534
FAIRCHILD AFB	ACC	WASHINGTON	523
FORT GEORGE G. MEADE	LEE	MARYLAND	252
GOODFELLOW AFB	ATC	TEXAS	431
GRAND FORKS AFB	ACC	NORTH DAKOTA	352
GUNTER ANNEX	AUN	ALABAMA	2
HICKAM AFB	PAF	HAWAII	219
HILL AFB	MTC	UTAH	502
HOLLOMAN AFB	ACC	NEW MEXICO	318
INCIRLIK AB	AFE	TURKEY	570

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM
FY 1994 PRESIDENT'S BUDGET
INSTALLATION INDEX

<u>INSTALLATION</u>	<u>HOST COMMAND</u>	<u>STATE/COUNTRY</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
KAENA POINT STS	PAF	HAWAII	226
KEESLER AFB	ATC	MISSISSIPPI	260
KELLY AFB	MTC	TEXAS	435
KIRTLAND AFB	AMC	NEW MEXICO	324
LACKLAND AFB	ATC	TEXAS	458
LACKLAND ANNEX	ATC	TEXAS	473
LANGLEY AFB	ACC	VIRGINIA	510
LAUGHLIN AFB	ATC	TEXAS	477
LITTLE ROCK AFB	AMC	ARKANSAS	65
LUKE AFB	ACC	ARIZONA	54
MALMSTROM AFB	AMC	MONTANA	292
MAXWELL AFB	AUN	ALABAMA	5
MCCHORD AFB	AMC	WASHINGTON	527
MCCLELLAN AFB	MTC	CALIFORNIA	81
MCCONNELL AFB	ACC	KANSAS	237
MEMPHIS NAS	NAV	TENNESSEE	420
MINOT AFB	ACC	NORTH DAKOTA	356
NAVAJO ARMY DEPOT	MTC	ARIZONA	61
NELLIS AFB	ACC	NEVADA	307
OFFUTT AFB	ACC	NEBRASKA	300
PATRICK AFB	SPC	FLORIDA	185
PETERSON AFB	SPC	COLORADO	116
POPE AFB	ACC	NORTH CAROLINA	341
RAF MILDENHALL	AFE	UNITED KINGDOM	574
RAMSTEIN AB	AFE	GERMANY	552
RANDOLPH AFB	ATC	TEXAS	487
REESE AFB	ATC	TEXAS	494
ROBINS AFB	ACC	GEORGIA	196
SCOTT AFB	AMC	ILLINOIS	230
SEYMOUR-JOHNSON AFB	ACC	NORTH CAROLINA	348
SHAW AFB	ACC	SOUTH CAROLINA	408
SHEPPARD AFB	ATC	TEXAS	495
THULE AB	SPC	GREENLAND	556
THUMRAIT AB	ACC	OMAN	567
TINKER AFB	MTC	OKLAHOMA	383
TRAVIS AFB	AMC	CALIFORNIA	84
TYNDALL AFB	ACC	FLORIDA	192

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM
FY 1994 PRESIDENT'S BUDGET
INSTALLATION INDEX

<u>INSTALLATION</u>	<u>HOST COMMAND</u>	<u>STATE/COUNTRY</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
USAF ACADEMY	AFA	COLORADO	127
VANCE AFB	ATC	OKLAHOMA	397
VANDENBERG AFB	SPC	CALIFORNIA	91
VARIOUS LOCATIONS	LEE	VARIOUS LOCATIONS	577
WHITEMAN AFB	ACC	MISSOURI	267
WRIGHT-PATTERSON AFB	MTC	OHIO	360

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM
FISCAL YEAR 1994

ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS

An economic evaluation has been accomplished for all projects costing over \$2 million and the results are addressed in the individual DD Forms 1391. Life cycle economic analyses or justifications why an economic analysis was not warranted will be submitted directly to the OSD staff at their request.

DESIGN FOR ACCESSIBILITY OF PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED PERSONNEL

In accordance with Public Law, 90-480, provisions for physically handicapped personnel will be provided for, where appropriate, in the design of facilities included in this program.

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

In accordance with Section 102(2) (c) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (PL 91-190), the environmental impact analysis process (EIAP) has been completed or is actively underway for all projects in the Air Force FY 1995 Military Construction Program.

EVALUATION OF FLOODPLAINS AND WETLANDS

All projects in the program have been evaluated for compliance with Executive Orders 11988, Floodplain Management, and 11990, Protection of Wetlands, and the Floodplain Management Guidelines of U.S. Water Resources Council. Projects have been sited to avoid or reduce the risk of flood loss, minimize the impact of floods on human safety, health and welfare, preserve and enhance the natural and beneficial values of wetlands and minimize the destruction, loss or degradation of wetlands.

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE

The FY 94 MILCON request includes \$140.8 million for requirements necessary to correct current environmental noncompliance situations and to prevent future noncompliance. The request is the result of an intense effort to correct environmental concerns existing in five major infrastructure areas: wastewater treatment systems, corrosion control systems, hydrant refueling systems, underground storage tank systems, and live fire training facilities.

FY 1994

CONGRESSIONAL REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

1. STATEMENTS ON NATO ELIGIBILITY

These are in response to the requirement in the FY 1988 Senate Appropriations Committee Report, 100-200, page 13, and are included in the appropriate project justifications.

2. STATEMENTS ON COMPLIANCE WITH CONSTRUCTION MANUAL 4210.1M

These are in response to the requirement in the FY 1988 Senate Appropriations Conference Report, 100-498, page 1003, and are included in each project justification.

3. NEW AND CURRENT MISSION ACTIVITIES

The FY 1989 Senate Appropriations Committee Report, 100-380, pages 10 and 11, identified a requirement to include an exhibit in the budget justification books that displayed required projects in two separate categories: New Mission and Current Mission. The CM (current mission) or NM (new mission) designation which follows the project on the listing at Tab D identifies each project as new or current mission. Additionally, each justification in Block 11 indicates whether the project supports a new or current mission.

4. RESOLUTION TRUST CORPORATION ASSETS

Senate Armed Services Committee Report 101-384, dated 20 July 1990, on the National Defense Authorization Act for FY 91 requested the Department to screen Resolution Trust Corporation assets to determine if proposed construction projects could be more economically met through the purchase of existing assets held by the Resolution Trust Corporation. The FY 94 Military Construction and Family Housing programs were compared to the current real estate asset inventory published by the Resolution Trust Corporation. It was determined and the Department certifies that no assets exist that can be economically used in lieu of the FY 94 projects requested.

THIRD PARTY FINANCING

Test of long-term facilities contracts

NONE

FY 1994
NON-MILCON CONSTRUCTION

This information is being provided in response to the requirement on page 1006 of the FY 1988 Appropriations Conference Report 100-498. Information on appropriations other than MILCON are on the following pages:

<u>PROGRAM</u>	<u>PAGE NUMBER</u>
Research and Development (RDT&E) *	F-5
Operations and Maintenance (O&M)	F-8

* Additional information on these projects is contained in the descriptive summaries for the Air Force Research, Development, Test and Evaluation Budget.

**FY 1994 FACILITIES REQUIRED BY A CONTRACTOR TO PERFORM A
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION CONTRACT
IN ACCORDANCE WITH 10 USC 2353 & DODI 7110.1-M**

<u>PRGM</u> <u>ELEM #</u>	<u>PROJECT #</u>	<u>PROJECT TITLE</u>	<u>BASE</u>	<u>COST</u> <u>(\$000)</u>
3.41.11F	XUMU921120	Add/Alter Space Launch Complex 4E, Titan IV Pgm (Martin-Marietta)	Vandenberg	2,000
3.41.11F	XUMU921123	Add to Launch Service Fac (Martin-Marietta)	Vandenberg	7,900
3.41.11F	XUMU921139P3	Space Launch Complex 3E Atlas II Conversion, Phase 3 (General Dynamics)	Vandenberg	<u>15,000</u>
TOTAL CONTRACTOR RDT&E:				\$24,900

FY 1994 PROJECTS FOR INSTALLATION OF
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION EQUIPMENT
IN ACCORDANCE WITH DODI 7110.1-M

<u>PGRM</u> <u>ELEM #</u>	<u>PROJECT #</u>	<u>PROJECT TITLE</u>	<u>BASE</u>	<u>COST</u> <u>(\$000)</u>
6.22.03F	ZHTV922211P3	Install High Mach Advanced Propulsion Research Equip	Wright-Patterson	250
6.22.03F	ZHTV942201	Install Structures Research Equipment	Wright-Patterson	4,200
6.22.03F	ZHTV942202	Install Electro-Mechanical Research Laboratory Equip	Wright-Patterson	925
6.22.03F	ZHTV942203	Install More Electric Aircraft Research Equip	Wright-Patterson	1,050
6.22.04F	ZHTV889101	Install Radar Signal Processing Lab Equip	Wright-Patterson	800
6.22.04F	ZHTV889113P2	Install Environmental Control System for Semi-Conductor Research, Phase 2	Wright-Patterson	950
6.22.04F	ZHTV889115P2	Install Molecular Beam Epitaxial System, Phase 2	Wright-Patterson	575
6.58.07F	ANZY900216P5	Install Test Unit Support System, Phase 5	Arnold	876
6.58.07F	ANZY940067P3	Install Aeropropulsion Systems Test Facility Icing System, Phase 3	Arnold	1,358
6.58.07F	FSPM942534	Install Weapons Systems Computer Equipment	Edwards	806
6.58.07F	ZHTV942200	Install Ventilation for Aircraft Modification Fac	Wright-Patterson	600

VARIOUS ANZY933008P2 Modify Hypersonic/ Arnold 3,800
Supersonic Wind Tunnel
Control Rooms. Phase 2

TOTAL RDT&E EQUIPMENT INSTALLATION: \$16,190
(Includes equipment cost)

**REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE
ACTIVE AIR FORCE
(\$ IN MILLIONS)**

	FY 1992 ACTUAL	FY 1993 ESTIMATE	FY 1994 ESTIMATE
--	---------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------

Appropriation Summary: Operation and Maintenance.	1,273.5	792.0	1,283.8
--	---------	-------	---------

Description of Operations Financed: Provides resources for in-service and contractual accomplishment of maintenance and repair work on buildings, structures, warehouses, roadways, runways and aprons, missile sites, railway trackage, utility plants and distribution systems. Also includes minor construction to erect, install or assemble a new facility or to expand, alter or convert an existing facility when costs of such minor construction do not exceed \$300 thousand for each project.

PROGRAM DATA

Maintenance and Repair of Real Property	1,137.8	734.3	969.3
Minor Construction	135.7	13.1	79.4
AMC DBOF		44.6	235.1
Backlog of Maintenance and Repair (BMAR)	1,599.5	2,033.9	2,338.9

PERSONNEL DATA

Active Air Force Personnel	822	593	504
Officer	15,779	10,996	9,766
Enlisted	16,601	11,589	10,270
Total			
Civilian Personnel	10,205	9,513	9,343
U.S. Direct Hires	484	322	330
Foreign Direct Hires	10,689	9,835	9,673
Total Direct Hires	11,173	10,157	9,803
Foreign National Indirect Hires	11,990	11,387	11,122
Total			

Discussion: The FY 1994 program includes a pricing increase of \$16.2M. The following major program changes are as follows: The FY 1993 Appropriation Act denied our requested funding transfer to MILCON for major repair and minor construction and established the Real Property Maintenance, Defense Account. This budget requests we again fund those programs in O&M (\$+578.3M). However, funding for the Air Force's Real Property Maintenance (RPM) program continues to decline at a rate faster than the rate of force structure drawdowns and installation closures/realignments (\$-107.9M). The FY 1993 RPM estimate which only funds 44.6% of requirements results in BMAR growth of \$434M. In FY 1994 we further reduced funding by \$25.4M due to fiscal austerity. Any further reductions will accelerate facility deterioration to an unacceptable level and begin to seriously impact mission readiness and combat capability. Also, we anticipate increased burdensharing from our allies which will reduce our needs (\$-24.1M). Finally, our FY 1994 request reflects increased customer funding to reimburse AMC DBOF, established in FY 1993, for Military Personnel (\$+70.9M).

APPROPRIATION LANGUAGE

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, facilities, and real property for the Air Force as currently authorized by law \$906,378,000 to remain available until September 30, 1998: Provided, that of this amount, not to exceed \$63,180,000, shall be available for study, planning, design, architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of his determination and the reasons therefor.

Military Construction, Air Force
Program and Financing (in Thousands of dollars) SUMMARY

Budget Plan (amounts for MILITARY
CONSTRUCTION actions programmed)

Identification code	57-3300-0-1-051	1992 actual	1993 est.	1994 est.	1995 est.
Program by activities:					
Direct program:					
00.0101	Major construction	1,032,396	618,780	836,354	726,383
00.0201	Minor construction	11,500	7,000	6,844	7,752
00.0301	Planning	69,900	92,000	63,180	64,812
00.0401	Supporting activities	6,000			
00.9101	Total direct program	1,119,796	717,780	906,378	798,947
01.0101	Reimbursable program	1,927	508	500	518
10.0001	Total	1,121,723	718,288	906,878	799,465

Financing:

Offsetting collections from:

11.0001	Federal funds (-)	-1,927	-508	-500	-518
17.0001	Recovery of prior year obligations				
21.4002	Unobligated balance available, start of year:				
21.4003	For completion of prior year budget plans				
21.4009	Available to finance new budget plans	-94,400			
22.0001	Reprogramming from/to prior year budget plans	-36,408			
24.4002	Unobligated balance transferred to other accounts	-22,642			
25.0001	Unobligated balance available, end of year:				
	For completion of prior year budget plans	6,838			
	Unobligated balance expiring				
40.0001	Budget authority (Appropriation)	973,184	717,780	906,378	798,947

Relation of obligations to outlays:

71.0001	Obligations incurred				
72.4001	Obligated balance, start of year				
74.4001	Obligated balance, end of year				
77.0001	Adjustments in expired accounts (net)				
78.0001	Adjustments in unexpired accounts				

90.0001 Outlays (net)

Obligations

Identification code	57-3300-0-1-051	1992 actual	1993 est.	1994 est.	1995 est.
Program by activities:					
Direct program:					
00.0101	Major construction	856,118	1,029,766	1,034,493	861,336
00.0201	Minor construction	10,558	10,997	7,332	9,622
00.0301	Planning	78,980	106,710	78,959	74,085
00.0401	Supporting activities	1,438	1,627	685	492
00.9101	Total direct program	947,094	1,149,100	1,121,469	945,535
01.0101	Reimbursable program	1,927	508	500	518
10.0001	Total	949,021	1,149,608	1,121,969	946,053
Financing:					
Offsetting collections from:					
11.0001	Federal funds(-)	-1,927	-508	-500	-518
17.0001	Recovery of prior year obligations	-12,936			
21.4002	Unobligated balance available, start of year:				
	For completion of prior year budget plans	-1,154,138	-1,303,369	-872,049	-656,958
21.4003	Available to finance new budget plans	-94,400			
21.4009	Reprogramming from/to prior year budget plans	-22,642			
22.0001	Unobligated balance transferred to other accounts				
	For completion of prior year budget plans	1,303,369	872,049	656,958	510,370
24.4002	Unobligated balance available, end of year:	6,838			
25.0001	Unobligated balance expiring				
40.0001	Budget authority (Appropriation)	973,184	717,780	906,378	798,947
Relation of obligations to outlays:					
71.0001	Obligations incurred	947,094	1,149,100	1,121,469	945,535
72.4001	Obligated balance, start of year	848,883	898,841	933,428	982,926
74.4001	Obligated balance, end of year	-898,841	-933,428	-982,926	-932,606
77.0001	Adjustments in expired accounts (net)	13,475			
78.0001	Adjustments in unexpired accounts	-12,936			
90.0001	Outlays (net)	897,675	1,114,513	1,071,971	995,855

Identification code	1992 actual	1993 est.	1994 est.	1995 est.
57-3300-0-1-051				
Direct obligations:				
132.001 Land and structures	181,561	126,085	152,339	190,068
199.001 Total Direct obligations	181,561	126,085	152,339	190,068
Reimbursable obligations:				
232.001 Land and structures	1,927	508	500	518
299.001 Total Reimbursable obligations	1,927	508	500	518
Allocation Accounts				
Other services:				
325.204 Other	81,137	129,434	150,252	143,741
332.001 Land and structures	684,396	893,581	818,878	611,726
399.001 Total Allocation Accounts	765,533	1,023,015	969,130	755,467
999.901 Total obligations	949,021	1,149,608	1,121,969	946,053
Obligations are distributed as follows:				
Defense-Military:Army	582,747	705,860	688,889	580,877
Defense-Military:Navy	127,494	154,047	150,344	126,770
Defense-Military:Air Force	229,690	278,205	271,517	228,945
Department of Transportation	9,090	11,496	11,219	9,461
Total Obligations	949,021	1,149,608	1,121,969	946,053

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)							2. DATE		
AIR FORCE											
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION MAXWELL AIR FORCE BASE, GUNTER ANNEX, ALABAMA					4. COMMAND AIR UNIVERSITY			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX 0.77			
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			TOTAL
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	
a. As of 30 SEP 92		235	1120	710	1	274	22	4	34	23	2,423
b. End FY 1998											
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (368)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)		84,990									
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:		31,960									
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:		4,680									
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)		13,700									
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:		9,500									
g. Remaining Deficiency:		0									
h. Grand Total:		144,830									
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE		SCOPE		COST (\$000)		DESIGN STATUS			
CODE								START		CML	
442-257		HAZARDOUS WASTE ACCUMULATION FACILITY		8,500 SF		310		OCT 92		MAY 93	
740-884		CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER		23,000 SF		2,700		SEP 92		SEP 93	
811-147		EMERGENCY POWER GENERATOR PLANT		3,000 KW		1,200		JUN 92		APR 93	
831-000		SPILL CONTAINMENT CONTROLS		600 SF		470		OCT 92		MAY 93	
				TOTAL:		4,680					
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995)											
610-281		COMPUTER SYSTEMS AND TRAINING FACILITY		66,500 SF		7,000					
610-711		RENOVATE COMPUTER OPERATIONS FACILITY		115,985 SF		3,700					
850-000		UPGRADE UTILITY SYSTEMS, PHASE I		LS		3,000					
				TOTAL:		13,700					
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
740-674		PHYSICAL FITNESS CENTER		28,200 SF		5,000					
812-223		IMPROVE PRIMARY OVERHEAD DIST LINE		LS		3,000					
842-245		UPGRADE WATER DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM		20,000 LF		1,500					
10. Mission or Major Functions: USAF Extension Course Institute; Air Force Senior Noncommissioned Officer Academy; Air Force Materiel Command Management Center; and Air Force Communications Command Standard Systems Center.											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:		0									
b. Water pollution:		3,000									
c. Occupational safety and health:		0									
d. Other Environmental:		0									

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION MAXWELL AIR FORCE BASE, GUNTER ANNEX, ALABAMA		4. PROJECT TITLE CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 9.12.12S	6. CATEGORY CODE 740-884	7. PROJECT NUMBER JUBJ943076	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 2,700	
9. COST ESTIMATES				
ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	SF	23,000	80	1,840
SUPPORTING FACILITIES				590
UTILITIES	LS			(230)
PAVEMENTS	LS			(70)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS	LS			(130)
COMMUNICATIONS SUPPORT	LS			(60)
DEMOLITION	LS			(100)
SUBTOTAL				2,430
CONTINGENCY (5%)				122
TOTAL CONTRACT COST				2,552
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)				153
TOTAL REQUEST				2,705
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)				2,700
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Concrete foundation and floor slab, masonry walls, structural steel frame and roof system. Includes multipurpose rooms for different age groups, management support space, storage, kitchen, activity and isolation rooms and other necessary support spaces. Demolition of existing substandard facility. Air Conditioning: 100 Tons.				
11. REQUIREMENT: 23,000 SF ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 19,732 SF <u>PROJECT</u> : Construct a child development center. (Current Mission) <u>REQUIREMENT</u> : A facility to provide for the care and development of a wide range of age groups of children of personnel assigned to this base. This care must be provided during regular duty hours and in support of after-hours mission requirements. A reliable, well managed, healthy and affordable center for the care of children aged six weeks through twelve years is essential. The requirements are based on 228 children, which was derived from the FY97 force structure. <u>CURRENT SITUATION</u> : The existing child development center is too small, poorly arranged for safe and effective child development support, and in substandard conditions not suitable for economic renovation. Storage space is inadequate; the functional arrangement is poor; and many rooms lack exits to the outside. More rooms are needed in order to meet required adult-to-child ratios per room. School age children are in the same facility as six-week to three-year-old children, which is against Air Force regulations. A better equipped kitchen is needed to meet health standards, and more bathroom facilities are needed to properly care for infants. The facility currently is filled to capacity with 80 children between the ages of six weeks and three years. Sixty preschool children are presently without a facility as the preschool facility was declared				

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION MAXWELL AIR FORCE BASE, GUNTER ANNEX, ALABAMA		
4. PROJECT TITLE CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	5. PROJECT NUMBER JUB943076	
<p>unusable in a recent DoD inspection. Forty children are currently on the waiting list. Home care is used to supplement the child care program, but is filled to capacity. Day care facilities in the area are triple the cost of the base program and are too expensive for the young enlisted personnel.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Eligible patrons will continue to be denied service. Personnel will be required to use more expensive off-base programs. This results in an additional hardship on military and civilian parents and is a career detractor.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> This project will replace the existing child development center and meets the criteria specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide."</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																																													
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION MAXWELL AIR FORCE BASE, GUNTER ANNEX, ALABAMA																																															
4. PROJECT TITLE CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	5. PROJECT NUMBER JUBJ943076																																														
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td colspan="3">(1) Status:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td></td> <td>92 SEP 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td></td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td></td> <td>92 NOV 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td></td> <td>93 SEP 20</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(2) Basis:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td></td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td></td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td></td> <td>162</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td></td> <td>81</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td></td> <td>243</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> <td>162</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td></td> <td>81</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(4) Construction Start</td> <td></td> <td>93 DEC</td> </tr> </table> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(1) Status:			(a) Date Design Started		92 SEP 15	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%	(c) Date 35% Designed		92 NOV 15	(d) Date Design Complete		93 SEP 20	(2) Basis:			(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A	(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)			(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		162	(b) All Other Design Costs		81	(c) Total		243	(d) Contract		162	(e) In-house		81	(4) Construction Start		93 DEC
(1) Status:																																															
(a) Date Design Started		92 SEP 15																																													
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%																																													
(c) Date 35% Designed		92 NOV 15																																													
(d) Date Design Complete		93 SEP 20																																													
(2) Basis:																																															
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO																																													
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A																																													
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)																																															
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		162																																													
(b) All Other Design Costs		81																																													
(c) Total		243																																													
(d) Contract		162																																													
(e) In-house		81																																													
(4) Construction Start		93 DEC																																													

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION MAXWELL AIR FORCE BASE, GUNTER ANNEX, ALABAMA		4. PROJECT TITLE EMERGENCY POWER GENERATOR PLANT			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 9.12.12S	6. CATEGORY CODE 811-147	7. PROJECT NUMBER JUBJ943073	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 1,200		
9. COST ESTIMATES					
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
EMERGENCY POWER GENERATOR PLANT			1		
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					1,080
DIESEL GENERATOR SETS INSTALLED		EA	3	360,000	(1,080)
SUBTOTAL					1,080
CONTINGENCY (5%)					54
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					1,134
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					68
TOTAL REQUEST					1,202
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					1,200
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Install three 1000 KW generators in the power plant area of Bldg 857. This work includes all associated cabling, connections, piping, etc., to provide a fully operational emergency backup power system.					
11. REQUIREMENT: 3,000 KW ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 0 PROJECT: Procure and install three 1000 KW generators. (New Mission) REQUIREMENT: Backup generators are required to sustain computer operations in support of aircraft readiness for the southeastern United States air defense during commercial power outages. DoD's Defense Management Report Decision 924 requires the Air Force to consolidate all standard base level computer functions from CONUS bases into five newly formed Regional Processing Centers. Located at Gunter Annex, the first center supports 19 active duty bases and 20 Air National Guard/Air Force Reserve units, totaling approximately 10,000 users. The center must be operational 24 hours per day and seven days per week. CURRENT SITUATION: DMRD 924 was approved in Feb 1991. The Air Force began moving the base computers to the Gunter Regionalized Processing Center during the summer of 1991. The computers are supported by an uninterruptable power supply (UPS) that conditions the power fed to the computers and provides up to 15 minutes of reserve battery power during commercial power outages. The Air Force will lease backup diesel generators to sustain the Center's operation during extended power outages as an interim measure until this project is approved. Leasing of these generators began in Jan 1992. IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: \$166,000 is spent annually from scarce operational and maintenance resources to continue the lease of the generators.					

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION MAXWELL AIR FORCE BASE, GUNTER ANNEX, ALABAMA		
4. PROJECT TITLE EMERGENCY POWER GENERATOR PLANT	5. PROJECT NUMBER JUBJ943073	
<p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> An economic analysis determined that it is more cost effective to purchase the generators rather than continue their lease. The discounted payback period to purchase generators vice continuing their lease is 4.4 years. There are no criteria for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide," or in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements."</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																																													
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION MAXWELL AIR FORCE BASE, GUNTER ANNEX, ALABAMA																																															
4. PROJECT TITLE EMERGENCY POWER GENERATOR PLANT	5. PROJECT NUMBER JUBJ943073																																														
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td colspan="3">(1) Status:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td></td> <td>92 JUN 03</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td></td> <td>40%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td></td> <td>92 OCT 14</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td></td> <td>93 APR 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(2) Basis:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td></td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td></td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td></td> <td>48</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td></td> <td>33</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td></td> <td>81</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td></td> <td>81</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(4) Construction Start</td> <td></td> <td>93 DEC</td> </tr> </table> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(1) Status:			(a) Date Design Started		92 JUN 03	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		40%	(c) Date 35% Designed		92 OCT 14	(d) Date Design Complete		93 APR 01	(2) Basis:			(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A	(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)			(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		48	(b) All Other Design Costs		33	(c) Total		81	(d) Contract			(e) In-house		81	(4) Construction Start		93 DEC
(1) Status:																																															
(a) Date Design Started		92 JUN 03																																													
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		40%																																													
(c) Date 35% Designed		92 OCT 14																																													
(d) Date Design Complete		93 APR 01																																													
(2) Basis:																																															
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO																																													
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A																																													
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)																																															
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		48																																													
(b) All Other Design Costs		33																																													
(c) Total		81																																													
(d) Contract																																															
(e) In-house		81																																													
(4) Construction Start		93 DEC																																													

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)							2. DATE		
AIR FORCE											
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION					4. COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX			
MAXWELL AIR FORCE BASE, ALABAMA					AIR UNIVERSITY			0.77			
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			TOTAL
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	
a. As of 30 SEP 92		973	1600	1466	1554	46	14				5,655
b. End FY 1998		1202	2731	2306	1557	457	36	4	34	23	8,350
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (3,528)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)		196,253									
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:		23,320									
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:		25,370									
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)		13,100									
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:		73,200									
g. Remaining Deficiency:		0									
h. Grand Total:		331,243									
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE		SCOPE		COST (\$000)		DESIGN STATUS			
CODE								START		CMPL	
111-111		EXTEND RUNWAY/UPGRADE		16,700 SY		9,200		AUG 92		JUL 93	
112-211		TAXIWAY/RAMP		111,200 SY		3,800		AUG 92		JUN 93	
171-851		AIR FORCE QUALITY CENTER		45,000 SF		4,650		NOV 92		SEP 93	
411-135		UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS		53 TK		1,700		OCT 92		MAY 93	
831-000		SPILL CONTAINMENT CONTROLS		LS		970		OCT 92		MAY 93	
850-000		UPGRADE UTILITY SYSTEMS, PHASE I		LS		5,050		AUG 92		JUN 93	
TOTAL:						25,370					
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995)											
724-417		ALTER DORMITORY		82 PN		3,500					
724-417		STUDENT DORMITORIES, PHASE I		200 PN		9,600					
TOTAL:						13,100					
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
112-211		REPAIR TAXIWAY		LS		3,500					
113-321		REPAIR APRONS		LS		4,000					
141-453		RENOVATE BASE OPERATIONS		22,607 SF		3,300					
724-417		VISITING OFFICERS QUARTERS		200 PN		9,800					
842-245		UPGRADE WATER DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM		35,000 LF		2,800					
10. Mission or Major Functions: Headquarters Air University; Air War College; Air Command and Staff College; Squadron Officers School; Center for Aerospace Doctrine, Research, and Education; Air Force Quality Center; Ira C. Eaker Center for Professional Development; Air Force Historical Research Agency; Headquarters Air Force Reserve Officer Training Corps; Headquarters Civil Air Patrol; Community College of the Air Force; an Air Force Reserve airlift group (C-130 aircraft); and Air Mobility Command airlift squadron (C-21 aircraft).											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:		0									
b. Water pollution:		5,200									
c. Occupational safety and health:		0									
d. Other Environmental:		0									

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE			
AIR FORCE								
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION				4. PROJECT TITLE				
MAXWELL AIR FORCE BASE, ALABAMA				EXTEND RUNWAY/UPGRADE				
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT		6. CATEGORY CODE	7. PROJECT NUMBER	8. PROJECT COST(\$000)				
9.12.12S		111-111	PNQS963107	9,200				
9. COST ESTIMATES								
ITEM					U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
EXTEND RUNWAY/UPGRADE					SY	16,700	66	1,102
SUPPORTING FACILITIES								6,765
UTILITIES/AIRFIELD LIGHTING SYSTEMS					LS			(380)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS					LS			(1,160)
PAVEMENTS					LS			(95)
SITE WORK FOR AIRFIELDS					LS			(20)
AIRFIELD PAVEMENTS					LS			(985)
MISC AIRFIELD WORK					LS			(50)
DEMOLISH PAVEMENTS					LS			(190)
OTHER SUPPORTING FACILITIES					LS			(3,885)
SUBTOTAL								7,867
CONTINGENCY (10%)								787
TOTAL CONTRACT COST								8,654
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)								519
TOTAL REQUEST								9,173
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)								9,200
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Extend existing runway 1,000 ft. Construct a 500 ft overrun, and parallel taxiway leading to new end of runway. Repair runway pavement, remove abandoned pavement, modify and paint runway and taxiway markings. Includes the extension of the instrument landing system, and relocation of the existing perimeter road, earthwork, aircraft arresting system, and other necessary support.								
11. REQUIREMENT: As required. <u>PROJECT:</u> Extend the primary runway and construct an overrun and parallel taxiway. (Current Mission) <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> The 1,000 foot runway extension would provide required emergency rollout for base and transient aircraft experiencing a major malfunction during takeoff or landing. All fighter and trainer aircraft using Maxwell AFB require waivers to flying regulations. This airfield is also an emergency recovery runway for the 187 FG (F-16) Air National Guard and commercial aircraft. Base mobility tasking will markedly increase with the recent change in Standards Systems Center DOC tasking. Air Mobility Command (AMC) cannot fully deploy from Maxwell AFB under OPLAN 410. It will also provide additional aircraft beddown options which are not currently available. <u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> Special flights which are associated with Air University have to land and depart from the commercial airport across town due to insufficient runway. Current airfield conditions require AMC to use ground transportation when deploying personnel/equipment. <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> The existing runway length will continue to be a serious safety hazard to transient or base aircraft. AMC will continue to use ground transportation and the runways at Ft Benning and Ft Rucker for deployment, as they did during Desert Storm, rather than deploy with								

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION MAXWELL AIR FORCE BASE, ALABAMA		
4. PROJECT TITLE EXTEND RUNWAY/UPGRADE	5. PROJECT NUMBER PNQS963107	
<p>C-141s from Maxwell Air Force Base.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL</u>: All known alternative options were considered during the development of this project. No other option could meet the mission requirements; therefore, a full economic analysis was not needed or performed. A certificate of exemption has been prepared. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements"</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																																													
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION MAXWELL AIR FORCE BASE, ALABAMA																																															
4. PROJECT TITLE EXTEND RUNWAY/UPGRADE	5. PROJECT NUMBER PNQS963107																																														
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td colspan="3">(1) Status:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td></td> <td>92 JUL 19</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td></td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td></td> <td>93 JAN 31</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td></td> <td>93 NOV 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(2) Basis:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td></td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td></td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td></td> <td>260</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td></td> <td>90</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td></td> <td>350</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td></td> <td>350</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(4) Construction Start</td> <td></td> <td>94 MAY</td> </tr> </table> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(1) Status:			(a) Date Design Started		92 JUL 19	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%	(c) Date 35% Designed		93 JAN 31	(d) Date Design Complete		93 NOV 15	(2) Basis:			(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A	(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)			(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		260	(b) All Other Design Costs		90	(c) Total		350	(d) Contract			(e) In-house		350	(4) Construction Start		94 MAY
(1) Status:																																															
(a) Date Design Started		92 JUL 19																																													
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%																																													
(c) Date 35% Designed		93 JAN 31																																													
(d) Date Design Complete		93 NOV 15																																													
(2) Basis:																																															
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO																																													
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A																																													
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)																																															
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		260																																													
(b) All Other Design Costs		90																																													
(c) Total		350																																													
(d) Contract																																															
(e) In-house		350																																													
(4) Construction Start		94 MAY																																													

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
AIR FORCE						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION				4. PROJECT TITLE		
MAXWELL AIR FORCE BASE, ALABAMA				TAXIWAY/RAMP		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT		6. CATEGORY CODE	7. PROJECT NUMBER	8. PROJECT COST(\$000)		
9.12.12S		112-211	PNQS903000	3,800		
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
TAXIWAY/RAMP		SY	29,480	108	3,253	
RESEAL JOINTS		LS			(352)	
REPLACE SLABS		LS			(1,454)	
PAINT AIRFIELD MARKINGS		LS			(267)	
RESEAL AND OVERLAY TAXIWAY		LS			(730)	
DEMOLITION		LS			(450)	
SUBTOTAL					3,253	
CONTINGENCY (10%)					325	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					3,578	
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					215	
TOTAL REQUEST					3,793	
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					3,800	
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Replace backer rod and reseal concrete joints. Replace eighty concrete slabs on the parking apron and apron access. Replace inlet grates. Reseal cracks, water blast, paint, overlay the runway, taxiway and parking apron. Demolish abandoned taxiway.						
11. REQUIREMENT: As required. PROJECT: Repair the taxiway, runway, parking apron and apron access. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: A runway, taxiway and parking apron that has a smooth, static, maintainable surface. The airfield is required to accommodate C-22, C-135, C-141 and 727 aircraft. CURRENT SITUATION: The joint sealer in many pavement joints has oxidized and separated, leaving the backer rod free to exit the joint and to be ingested through a jet engine. Many slabs are shattered, inlet grates are broken, and taxiway surfaces are rough. Incompressible particles in the joints are causing the pavement to "grow". Loaded slabs are pumping and causing subgrade degradation. Weight restrictions imposed by the Air Field Manager prohibit C-141, C-135, and C-22 aircraft from landing and result in diversion of air traffic to non-Air Force facilities. IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: A backer rod ingested through an aircraft engine would result in the loss of that engine. Should rubber be allowed to accumulate on the runway, a landing aircraft could skid off the runway, resulting in loss of or damage to the aircraft. Cracks will continue to deteriorate and produce Foreign Object Damage (FOD) to the fuselage, tires, and wings of aircraft. Water underneath the slab causes pumping that further deteriorates the subgrade and slab. Accumulated damage may result in airfield closure at Maxwell.						

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION MAXWELL AIR FORCE BASE, ALABAMA		
4. PROJECT TITLE TAXIWAY/RAMP	5. PROJECT NUMBER PNQS903000	
<p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> All known alternative options were considered during the development of this project. No other option could meet the mission requirements; therefore, a full economic analysis was not needed or performed. A certificate of exemption has been prepared. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements".</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	.FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																																													
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION MAXWELL AIR FORCE BASE, ALABAMA																																															
4. PROJECT TITLE TAXIWAY/RAMP	5. PROJECT NUMBER PNQS903000																																														
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td colspan="3">(1) Status:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td></td> <td>92 AUG 13</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td></td> <td>40%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td></td> <td>92 OCT 23</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td></td> <td>93 JUN 23</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(2) Basis:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td></td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td></td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td></td> <td>234</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td></td> <td>117</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td></td> <td>351</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> <td>234</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td></td> <td>117</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(4) Construction Start</td> <td></td> <td>93 DEC</td> </tr> </table> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(1) Status:			(a) Date Design Started		92 AUG 13	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		40%	(c) Date 35% Designed		92 OCT 23	(d) Date Design Complete		93 JUN 23	(2) Basis:			(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A	(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)			(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		234	(b) All Other Design Costs		117	(c) Total		351	(d) Contract		234	(e) In-house		117	(4) Construction Start		93 DEC
(1) Status:																																															
(a) Date Design Started		92 AUG 13																																													
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		40%																																													
(c) Date 35% Designed		92 OCT 23																																													
(d) Date Design Complete		93 JUN 23																																													
(2) Basis:																																															
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO																																													
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A																																													
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)																																															
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		234																																													
(b) All Other Design Costs		117																																													
(c) Total		351																																													
(d) Contract		234																																													
(e) In-house		117																																													
(4) Construction Start		93 DEC																																													

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE			
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION MAXWELL AIR FORCE BASE, ALABAMA				4. PROJECT TITLE AIR FORCE QUALITY CENTER				
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 9.12.12S		6. CATEGORY CODE 171-851	7. PROJECT NUMBER PNQS913012		8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 4,650			
9. COST ESTIMATES								
ITEM					U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
AIR FORCE QUALITY CENTER					SF	45,000	78	3,510
SUPPORTING FACILITIES								680
UTILITIES					LS			(150)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS					LS			(150)
PAVEMENTS					LS			(150)
DEMOLITION					LS			(230)
SUBTOTAL								4,190
CONTINGENCY (5%)								210
TOTAL CONTRACT COST								4,400
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)								264
TOTAL REQUEST								4,664
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)								4,650
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Reinforced concrete foundation and floor slab, structural steel frame, masonry walls, roof, fire protection system, utilities, and necessary support. Building includes classrooms, seminar rooms, auditoriums, academic offices, and administrative support areas. Demolition of three WW II vintage buildings. Site improvements. Air Conditioning: 325 Tons.								
11. REQUIREMENT: 148,502 SF ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 166,336 SF PROJECT: Construct Air Force Quality Center (AFQC) facility. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: An adequately sized facility to house the Air Force Quality Center (AFQC), one school of the Center for Professional Development (CPD), and the USAF Chaplain Resource Board. The AFQC provides commanders and their organizations with concepts, methods, tools and advice for attaining a total quality culture. It also serves as a clearing house for total quality related literature and information. The CPD consists of eight schools currently offering over 57 separate Professional Continuing Education courses for nearly 4,000 Air Force, DoD, and other government agency and international officer students. In addition, the CPD is the home of the USAF Chaplain Resource Board, the Enlisted PME Support Center, and two supporting directorates. The Chaplain Resource Board is an extension of the Chaplain Headquarters. The AFQC and CPD programs offer similar classroom instruction. Combining the CPD school with the AFQC allows the shared use of common spaces, auditorium and seminar rooms and reduces the overall project requirements. CURRENT SITUATION: The AFQC requires room for administration and classrooms. The CPD consists of the USAF Chaplain Resource Board and								

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION MAXWELL AIR FORCE BASE, ALABAMA		
4. PROJECT TITLE AIR FORCE QUALITY CENTER	5. PROJECT NUMBER PNQS913012	
<p>eight schools offering over 50 separate courses for nearly 5,000 military and civilian employees and international officer students. These functions currently are located in nine buildings on Maxwell and Gunter. Only one of these buildings was constructed for classrooms, and their scattered arrangement hampers CPD's educational effectiveness. Adequate classrooms are vacant in some facilities while other classrooms are crowded or inappropriate for the classes being taught.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Units displaced by AFQC will lose time, effort, and efficiency through separation of resources and individual classrooms. CPD will continue to face mission constraints and inefficient distribution of space. Major repairs to the structural and mechanical systems of old facilities and high utility costs will be required to allow classes to continue as scheduled. The Chaplain School will be unable to meet new demands associated with greater religious diversity in the USAF. The International Officer School must use available auditorium and seminar rooms on the Academic Circle, separating international students from staff support and the language laboratory.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> This project includes disposal of a number of substandard facilities: demolition of 24,315 SF in two buildings that currently house 14% of the CPD classrooms and are scattered throughout Maxwell and Gunter, and demolition of 46,259 SF in a WW II hangar located on the site for this project. An economic analysis was prepared comparing the alternatives of new construction, revitalization, leasing and status quo operation. Based on the present value and benefits of the respective alternatives, new construction was determined to be more cost-effective over the life of the project. This project meets the criteria specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide."</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	: FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION MAXWELL AIR FORCE BASE, ALABAMA																								
4. PROJECT TITLE AIR FORCE QUALITY CENTER	5. PROJECT NUMBER PNQS913012																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="360 632 1435 762"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 NOV 10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 DEC 10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 SEP 20</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="360 825 1435 888"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="360 951 1435 1108"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>288</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>264</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>552</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>552</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 NOV 10	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 DEC 10	(d) Date Design Complete	93 SEP 20	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	288	(b) All Other Design Costs	264	(c) Total	552	(d) Contract	552	(e) In-house	
(a) Date Design Started	92 NOV 10																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 DEC 10																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 SEP 20																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	288																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	264																							
(c) Total	552																							
(d) Contract	552																							
(e) In-house																								

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)		2. DATE	
AIR FORCE					
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION			4. PROJECT TITLE		
MAXWELL AIR FORCE BASE, ALABAMA			UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT	6. CATEGORY CODE	7. PROJECT NUMBER	8. PROJECT COST(\$000)		
8.57.56U	411-135	PNQS933071	1,700		
9. COST ESTIMATES					
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS		LS			1,456
REMOVE TANKS		EA	35	9,940	(348)
REPLACE/RETROFIT		EA	16	69,250	(1,108)
SUBTOTAL					1,456
CONTINGENCY (10%)					146
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					1,602
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					96
TOTAL REQUEST					1,698
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					1,700
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Remove and dispose of 35 Underground Storage Tanks (UST). Replace 16 USTs to include new piping. Test and remediate the associated soil as required. Provide and install clean fill soil and restore the tank site to its original condition.					
11. REQUIREMENT: As required. <u>PROJECT</u> : Replace underground fuel storage tanks. (Current Mission) <u>REQUIREMENT</u> : This is a Level II environmental compliance project to upgrade all underground storage tanks regulated by 40 CFR 280 to new standards by December 1998. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has set standards that require all regulated USTs to have leak detection, corrosion protection, and spill/overflow prevention systems. If USTs are to be replaced, Air Force policy is to replace them with above-ground tanks or to relocate them into underground vaults wherever possible. However, existing underground petroleum product storage tanks that are in good condition may be upgraded in place to bring them into compliance with applicable UST standards. <u>CURRENT SITUATION</u> : 35 USTs are no longer required because of changes in the procurement of natural gas at the wellhead, eliminating the need for fuel oil. A reduction in the number of emergency generators has further reduced the need for USTs. 16 USTs, used for base fuels and emergency generators, require retrofitting or replacement. The majority of these USTs are constructed of steel and are approximately 20 years old. There exists no cathodic spill/overflow protection. <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED</u> : The environmental threat increases each day the existing USTs are not removed and/or retrofitted. In addition, state and Federal laws are becoming more expensive for compliance in the USTs program. Leaking USTs can result in pollution of the environment.					

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																																													
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION MAXWELL AIR FORCE BASE, ALABAMA																																															
4. PROJECT TITLE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	5. PROJECT NUMBER PNQS933071																																														
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td colspan="3">(1) Status:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td></td> <td>92 OCT 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td></td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td></td> <td>92 NOV 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td></td> <td>93 MAY 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(2) Basis:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td></td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td></td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td></td> <td>161</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td></td> <td>161</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td></td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(4) Construction Start</td> <td></td> <td>93 DEC</td> </tr> </table> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(1) Status:			(a) Date Design Started		92 OCT 01	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%	(c) Date 35% Designed		92 NOV 01	(d) Date Design Complete		93 MAY 01	(2) Basis:			(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A	(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)			(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		161	(b) All Other Design Costs			(c) Total		161	(d) Contract			(e) In-house		10	(4) Construction Start		93 DEC
(1) Status:																																															
(a) Date Design Started		92 OCT 01																																													
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%																																													
(c) Date 35% Designed		92 NOV 01																																													
(d) Date Design Complete		93 MAY 01																																													
(2) Basis:																																															
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO																																													
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A																																													
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)																																															
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		161																																													
(b) All Other Design Costs																																															
(c) Total		161																																													
(d) Contract																																															
(e) In-house		10																																													
(4) Construction Start		93 DEC																																													

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)		2. DATE	
AIR FORCE					
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION			4. PROJECT TITLE		
MAXWELL AIR FORCE BASE, ALABAMA			UPGRADE UTILITY SYSTEMS, PHASE I		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT	6. CATEGORY CODE	7. PROJECT NUMBER	8. PROJECT COST(\$000)		
9.12.12S	850-000	PNQ5692102	5,050		
9. COST ESTIMATES					
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
UPGRADE UTILITY SYSTEMS, PHASE I		LS			2,652
GAS MAINS		LF	4,800	68	(326)
SEWER MAINS		LF	4,400	98	(431)
PRIMARY ELECTRIC		LF	2,500	68	(170)
STEAM MAINS		LF	5,200	175	(910)
STORM DRAINS		LF	4,900	78	(382)
WATER MAINS		LF	6,100	71	(433)
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					1,675
SIDEWALK REPLACEMENT		LF	2,600	21	(55)
ROAD REPLACEMENT		SY	14,100	115	(1,620)
SUBTOTAL					4,327
CONTINGENCY (10%)					433
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					4,760
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					286
TOTAL REQUEST					5,046
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					5,050
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Demolition of the existing pavement, utilities and facilities. Concrete and asphalt pavement, compacted subgrade, signs, signals, sidewalk, curb and gutter, utilities, storm drainage, and striping. Replace steam, gas, water and sewer mains. Install underground electrical.					
11. REQUIREMENT: As required. PROJECT: Upgrade the utility systems, Phase I. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: The sanitary sewer, gas piping, water mains, steam piping (supply and return) are required to be in a safe, repairable, maintainable and environmentally sound condition. A utility system adequate to meet the present and future requirements is needed. The significant underground work will require replacement of streets, curbs, gutters, and some sidewalks. This project is phase 1 of a three-phase project. CURRENT SITUATION: The utility lines were installed between 1930 and 1940. The sanitary sewer system has cracked and crushed lines, and there are cross-connects between sanitary sewer and storm mains. The cracked lines allow raw sewage to leak into the ground water and storm water runoff to flood the sewage treatment plant. The raw sewage that enters the storm drains flows into the Alabama River. The gas and water lines may not be isolated due to inoperative valves. The steam lines leak, and the deteriorated insulation results in a constant loss of heat and energy. IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: Although the base has not been cited to date for non-compliance with environmental regulations, raw sewage will continue to flow into the waterways unless a major upgrade is done to the system. Energy loss from the steam supply and return lines will worsen. Large areas of the base will continue, unnecessarily, to be without gas or water because of inoperative or nonexistent valves. Natural gas in unvalved					

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION MAXWELL AIR FORCE BASE, ALABAMA		
4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE UTILITY SYSTEMS, PHASE I	5. PROJECT NUMBER PNQS892102	
<p>sections has the potential to fuel fires.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> This project meets the criteria specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide."</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																																													
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION MAXWELL AIR FORCE BASE, ALABAMA																																															
4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE UTILITY SYSTEMS, PHASE I	5. PROJECT NUMBER PNQS892102																																														
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td colspan="3">(1) Status:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td></td> <td>92 AUG 13</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td></td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td></td> <td>92 OCT 23</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td></td> <td>93 JUN 23</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(2) Basis:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td></td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td></td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td></td> <td>312</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td></td> <td>288</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td></td> <td>600</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td></td> <td>600</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(4) Construction Start</td> <td></td> <td>93 DEC</td> </tr> </table> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(1) Status:			(a) Date Design Started		92 AUG 13	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%	(c) Date 35% Designed		92 OCT 23	(d) Date Design Complete		93 JUN 23	(2) Basis:			(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A	(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)			(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		312	(b) All Other Design Costs		288	(c) Total		600	(d) Contract			(e) In-house		600	(4) Construction Start		93 DEC
(1) Status:																																															
(a) Date Design Started		92 AUG 13																																													
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%																																													
(c) Date 35% Designed		92 OCT 23																																													
(d) Date Design Complete		93 JUN 23																																													
(2) Basis:																																															
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO																																													
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A																																													
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)																																															
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		312																																													
(b) All Other Design Costs		288																																													
(c) Total		600																																													
(d) Contract																																															
(e) In-house		600																																													
(4) Construction Start		93 DEC																																													

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)							2. DATE		
AIR FORCE											
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION CAPE ROMANZOF LONG RANGE RADAR SITE, ALASKA					4. COMMAND PACIFIC AIR FORCES			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX 0.00			
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			TOTAL
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	
a. As of 30 SEP 92											
b. End FY 1998											
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (4,900)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92) 15,556											
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory: 0											
d. Authorization Requested In This Program: 3,350											
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995) 0											
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years: 0											
g. Remaining Deficiency: 0											
h. Grand Total: 18,906											
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE			SCOPE			COST (\$000)		DESIGN STATUS	
CODE										START Cmpl	
890-151		REPLACE TRAMWAY SYSTEM			LS			3,350		AUG 92 JUL 93	
							TOTAL:		3,350		
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995) NONE											
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
10. Mission or Major Functions: An air control group which provides early warning defense.											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:										0	
b. Water pollution:										0	
c. Occupational safety and health:										0	
d. Other Environmental:										0	

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION CAPE ROMANZOF LONG RANGE RADAR SITE, ALASKA		4. PROJECT TITLE REPLACE TRAMWAY SYSTEM		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 1.28.96	6. CATEGORY CODE 890-151	7. PROJECT NUMBER DBWT891003	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 3,350	
9. COST ESTIMATES				
ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
REPLACE TRAMWAY SYSTEM	LS			3,000
UPPER/LOWER TERMINAL BUILDINGS	LS			(900)
STRUCTURAL TOWERS	LS			(800)
CABLE/TRAM/POWER ASSEMBLY	LS			(1,000)
DEMOLITION	LS			(300)
SUBTOTAL				3,000
CONTINGENCY (5%)				150
TOTAL CONTRACT COST				3,150
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6.5%)				205
TOTAL REQUEST				3,355
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)				3,350
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Replace the tramway system. Work includes concrete terminal buildings, towers, carriage car, power assembly, cable, controls, and other necessary support. Demolition and disposal of existing system.				
11. REQUIREMENT: As required. PROJECT: Replace tramway system. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: An operable and dependable tram system giving access for personnel and materials from lower to upper camp facilities. The Cape Romanzof site performs the primary mission of radar surveillance for the Alaskan coast, plus is a weather data collection point and serves a drug interdiction role. Access to the upper camp, where operational facilities are located, is vital to performing the site mission. This site operates year round and there is no alternative to perform the site mission. This is a RAC 2(IC) hazard abatement project identified in Oct 1991. CURRENT SITUATION: The existing tram has not been significantly renovated since its original construction in the 1950s and is now well past its useful life. The terminal buildings are significantly corroded. The power assembly and drive train are antiquated and parts are impossible to obtain. The controls are minimally functional. The towers are severely corroded and foundation connections are structurally questionable. The tram car is unsafe and has no enclosure. The tram is used for two to three round trips per day over half the year (all winter) when road access is impossible. It is a 45 degree slope up to the radar, climbing over 600 feet from bottom to mountain top. Keeping the road clear during winter is not possible at this remote and minimally manned site. This is a untenable situation with the current tram as the only transport to and from the upper level during the long winter. Personnel safety is at risk.				

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	.FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION CAPE ROMANZOF LONG RANGE RADAR SITE, ALASKA		
4. PROJECT TITLE REPLACE TRAMWAY SYSTEM	5. PROJECT NUMBER DBWT891003	
<p>The RAC was assigned due to system deterioration and while a potential threat to life, it does not qualify as an emergency requiring immediate construction. FY94 MILCON is adequate for replacement of the tram but correcting this problem should not be delayed beyond that time.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> The tram system could fail at any time. If this happens, it is likely that loss of life and/or serious injury would result. Additionally, after such a failure, the transportation of supplies and personnel would cease for that winter season. This would dramatically impact or could terminate the site mission.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> The existing tram has been assigned an Occupational Safety Risk Assessment Code (RAC) of 2(I,c), which constitutes "threat to life and property". A preliminary analysis of reasonable options for accomplishing this project (status quo, renovation, new construction and alternate methods of transport) was done. It indicates there is only one option that satisfies statutory requirements. Because of this, a full economic analysis was not performed. A certificate of exclusion has been prepared. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide".</p>		

1. COMPONENT	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
AIR FORCE		
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION		
CAPE ROMANZOF LONG RANGE RADAR SITE, ALASKA		
4. PROJECT TITLE	5. PROJECT NUMBER	
REPLACE TRAMWAY SYSTEM	DBWT891003	
12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:		
a. Estimated Design Data:		
(1) Status:		
(a) Date Design Started		92 AUG 03
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%
(c) Date 35% Designed		92 AUG 28
(d) Date Design Complete		93 JUL 30
(2) Basis:		
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)		
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		164
(b) All Other Design Costs		134
(c) Total		298
(d) Contract		134
(e) In-house		164
(4) Construction Start		94 FEB
b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)						2. DATE			
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION EIELSON AIR FORCE BASE, ALASKA				4. COMMAND PACIFIC AIR FORCES			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX 1.96				
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			TOTAL
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	
a. As of 30 SEP 92		269	2725	323	28	29					3,374
b. End FY 1998		270	2510	407	28	28					3,243
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (19,991)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)										380,050	
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:										105,250	
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:										7,800	
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)										23,800	
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:										25,600	
g. Remaining Deficiency:										0	
h. Grand Total:										542,500	
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE			SCOPE	COST (\$000)	DESIGN STATUS				
CODE						START	Cmpl				
179-511	FIRE TRAINING FACILITY			LS	2,400	APR 92	DEC 93				
740-884	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER			22,900 SF	5,400	JUL 92	DEC 93				
					TOTAL:	7,800					
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995)											
130-142	FIRE STATION			24,364 SF	2,500						
215-552	WEAPONS AND RELEASE SYSTEMS FACILITY			29,000 SF	6,200						
218-712	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT FACILITY			19,500 SF	6,700						
442-758	FLIGHTLINE SUPPLY CENTER			37,900 SF	6,800						
831-168	ADD TO WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT			LS	1,600						
					TOTAL:	23,800					
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
121-122	REPLACE HYDRANT FUELING SYSTEM			LS	15,000						
811-149	BASE AUXILARY POWER FACILITY			LS	2,250						
821-117	UPGRADE HEAT/POWER PLANT			LS	5,400						
880-232	UPGRADE ALERT HANGER FIRE SUPPRESSION SYSTEM			25,600 SF	1,550						
880-232	UPGRADE FIRE SUPPRESSION MULTI			58,906 SF	600						
10. Mission or Major Functions: A fighter wing with one fighter squadron (F-16 aircraft) and one air control squadron (OA-10 aircraft); a fighter training squadron responsible for Cope Thunder exercises; Air National Guard air refueling squadron (KC-135 aircraft) and air support group (C-26 aircraft); and the Air Training Command Arctic Survival School.											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:										0	
b. Water pollution:										1,500	
c. Occupational safety and health:										4,670	
d. Other Environmental:										0	

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)		2. DATE	
AIR FORCE					
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION			4. PROJECT TITLE		
EIELSON AIR FORCE BASE, ALASKA			FIRE TRAINING FACILITY		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT	6. CATEGORY CODE	7. PROJECT NUMBER	8. PROJECT COST(\$000)		
2.74.56P	179-511	FTQW933008	2,400		
9. COST ESTIMATES					
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
FIRE TRAINING FACILITY		LS			1,790
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					375
UTILITIES		LS			(55)
LARGE FRAME AIRCRAFT MOCKUP		LS			(120)
SMOKE HOUSE/DRAFTING PIT		LS			(200)
SUBTOTAL					2,165
CONTINGENCY (5%)					108
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					2,273
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6.5%)					148
TOTAL REQUEST					2,421
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					2,400
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Construct a fire training facility that includes a pit with an impervious liner, concrete/metal edge, large scale aircraft mock-up, smoke house, drafting pit, fuel dispensing system, drain system, leak detectors, paved access, flood lighting, and all necessary support.					
11. REQUIREMENT: As required. <u>PROJECT:</u> Construct a fire training facility. (Current Mission) <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> This is a Level I environmental compliance project. A live fire training facility meeting all environmental and safety regulations is required. Live fire training exercises, an FAA quarterly requirement, enable fire fighters to maintain a high level of proficiency by extinguishing two types of live fires: mass fuel spills and three dimensional (running fuel) fires. These exercises, performed on mock-ups typical of the mission assigned aircraft, have historically created compliance problems with the Clean Water Act. An impermeable lining below the pit area is required to prevent waste oils and fuels from leaching into the ground and to prevent groundwater from becoming contaminated by residual unburned fuel. <u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> On 20 May 91, live fire training exercises were ceased at all PACAF facilities without an impervious lining. The existing fire training facility at Eielson AFB fell into this category. This cessation only allows the base to conduct aggressive approach exercises with water discharges only. The existing fire training area has unacceptable environmental, safety and operational shortcomings. It does not have high density polyethylene flexible membrane liners and nets, a leak detection system, nor spill containment capability and is thus in violation of current EPA directives. The aircraft mock-up is pieced together and					

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	.FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION EIELSON AIR FORCE BASE, ALASKA		
4. PROJECT TITLE FIRE TRAINING FACILITY	5. PROJECT NUMBER FTQW933008	
<p>unsafe for rescue practices. The existing site is not level, has poor drainage, and inadequate maneuvering room for crash trucks, making winter use impossible. In the past, waste and other fuels were poured onto the mock-up and ignited to simulate a crashed aircraft. Under these conditions, portions of the waste fuels not consumed by the fire would percolate into the ground along with fire fighting foam residues. This practice posed a serious threat to the groundwater resources. There is no other option than on-base training as Eielson AFB cannot provide adequate fire protection and crash/rescue service if conducting training off-base or out of state. Firefighters must train as a team to benefit from crash rescue live fire exercises.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> The existing fire training facility will remain out of compliance with EPA standards and cannot be used as a fully operational fire training facility. Fire fighters will not be able to conduct essential training, so they cannot maintain proficiency in fighting aircraft fires. The lack of realistic training could result in loss of life or valuable aircraft during actual aircraft emergencies, crashes or structural fires.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements". A preliminary analysis of reasonable options for accomplishing this project (status quo, renovation and new construction) was done. It indicates there is only one option that satisfies statutory requirements. Because of this, a full economic analysis was not performed. A certificate of exclusion has been prepared.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION EIELSON AIR FORCE BASE, ALASKA																								
4. PROJECT TITLE FIRE TRAINING FACILITY	5. PROJECT NUMBER FTQW933008																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="343 625 1404 751"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 APR 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 JUL 22</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 DEC 01</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="343 821 1387 877"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>YES</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>EIELSON</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="343 947 1404 1100"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>120</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>73</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>193</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>153</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 JAN</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 APR 15	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 JUL 22	(d) Date Design Complete	93 DEC 01	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	YES	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	EIELSON	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	120	(b) All Other Design Costs	73	(c) Total	193	(d) Contract	40	(e) In-house	153
(a) Date Design Started	92 APR 15																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 JUL 22																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 DEC 01																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	YES																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	EIELSON																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	120																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	73																							
(c) Total	193																							
(d) Contract	40																							
(e) In-house	153																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION EIELSON AIR FORCE BASE, ALASKA				4. PROJECT TITLE CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 1.28.96		6. CATEGORY CODE 740-884	7. PROJECT NUMBER FTQW850024R1	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 5,400		
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER		SF	22,900	180	4,122	
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					750	
UTILITIES		LS			(235)	
PAVEMENTS		LS			(145)	
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(285)	
PLAYGROUND EQUIPMENT		LS			(65)	
FENCING		LS			(20)	
SUBTOTAL					4,872	
CONTINGENCY (5%)					244	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					5,116	
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6.5%)					333	
TOTAL REQUEST					5,449	
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					5,400	
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Concrete foundation and floor slab over non-frost susceptible soil, concrete block walls, membrane assembly roof, and hot water/glycol heating system. Includes all utilities, pavements, site cleanup, fencing, fire protection, playground and other necessary support.						
11. REQUIREMENT: 22,900 SF ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 7,641 SF PROJECT: Construct a child development center. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: An adequate facility to provide supervised care and developmental experiences for over 300 dependent children aged six weeks through ten years. The child development center must provide a comfortable, clean, educational environment where servicemen and women can leave their children on an hourly, daily, or drop-in basis without worrying about the level or nature of care. CURRENT SITUATION: The existing child development center is inadequate in location and size. The facility is bounded on the south and west sides by two major streets and on the north and east by the BX-commissary parking lot preventing further expansion. The increase in base population due to the F-16 beddown, only compounds the existing facility's deficiencies. The closest off-base child care center is approximately a sixteen mile roundtrip, a hazardous journey in winter due to arctic weather conditions. The military readiness of married and single personnel assigned is dependent on readily available child care, which enables military members to participate in alerts, training exercises and other mission demands. The high cost of living in Alaska often requires both spouses to work, forcing families to send their children to child care at a rate higher than the national average. Due to the remote location of Eielson AFB from nearby communities, civilian employees are also authorized use of the						

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION EIELSON AIR FORCE BASE, ALASKA		
4. PROJECT TITLE CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	5. PROJECT NUMBER FTQW850024R1	
<p>child development center. Approximately 170 children use the day-care and preschool programs daily. The center has a waiting list of 60 children for preschool and 150 children for full time day-care slots. The existing facility lacks proper storage space requiring supplies to be stored in other facilities. The electrical fixtures are not childproof and the steam radiators are located too low, posing a safety hazard for the children. The kitchen is too small for the commercial cooking equipment required. The facility lacks sufficient staff office area. Also, of the 170 children currently accommodated, 10 are cared for outside of the main facility in a portion of the Youth Center.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Mission readiness is affected because eligible military parents will continue to be denied basic child care and development services. Personnel will be forced to use expensive off-base services, located far from the base. The lack of affordable and quality services results in undue hardship on military families. Over the long term, the consequences are detrimental to productivity, motivation, and ultimately retention.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of new construction, revitalization, leasing and status quo operation. Based on present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, new construction was found to be the most cost efficient over the life of the project. This project meets the criteria/scope specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide".</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	.FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION EIELSON AIR FORCE BASE, ALASKA																								
4. PROJECT TITLE CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	5. PROJECT NUMBER FTQW850024R1																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="360 625 1435 751"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 JUL 24</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 OCT 20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 DEC 31</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="360 814 1435 877"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="360 940 1435 1098"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>332</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>161</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>493</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>90</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>403</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 MAR</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 JUL 24	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 OCT 20	(d) Date Design Complete	93 DEC 31	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	332	(b) All Other Design Costs	161	(c) Total	493	(d) Contract	90	(e) In-house	403
(a) Date Design Started	92 JUL 24																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 OCT 20																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 DEC 31																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	332																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	161																							
(c) Total	493																							
(d) Contract	90																							
(e) In-house	403																							

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)							2. DATE		
AIR FORCE											
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION					4. COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX			
ELMENDORF AIR FORCE BASE, ALASKA					PACIFIC AIR FORCES			1.69			
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			TOTAL
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	
a. As of 30 SEP 92		914	6092	991				18	75	402	8,492
b. End FY 1998		944	6129	1012				18	75	402	8,580
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (18,561)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)		397,547									
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:		35,250									
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:		30,805									
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)		770									
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:		57,799									
g. Remaining Deficiency:		0									
h. Grand Total:		522,171									
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE		SCOPE		COST (\$000)		DESIGN STATUS			
<u>CODE</u>								<u>START</u>		<u>CMPL</u>	
211-159		CORROSION CONTROL FACILITY		24,000 SF		5,975		JUL 92		JUL 93	
216-642		MUNITIONS MAINTENANCE FACILITY		6,000 SF		2,100		JUL 92		JUL 93	
422-275		MUNITIONS EQUIPMENT FACILITY		LS		1,860		JUL 92		DEC 93	
442-257		HAZARDOUS WASTE STORAGE FACILITY		20,000 SF		3,900		JUL 92		OCT 93	
722-351		DINING FACILITY		20,000 SF		6,800		JUL 92		NOV 93	
740-884		CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER		22,900 SF		5,070		JUL 92		NOV 93	
832-266		ADD TO SANITARY SEWER SYSTEM		17,700 LF		5,100		JUL 92		FEB 94	
				TOTAL:		30,805					
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995)											
131-132		MILSTAR COMMUNICATIONS GROUND TERMINAL		600 SF		770					
				TOTAL:		770					
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
112-211		WIDEN TAXIWAY		14,000 SY		1,500					
215-552		WEAPONS AND RELEASE SYSTEMS SHOP		11,500 SF		3,200					
422-264		MUNITIONS STORAGE IGLOOS		10,200 SF		4,800					
442-758		AIRCRAFT PARTS WAREHOUSE		40,000 SF		7,500					
610-285		ADD TO REGION OPERATIONS CONTROL CENTER		7,500 SF		5,800					
10. Mission or Major Functions: Headquarters Alaskan Command; Headquarters Eleventh Air Force; a flying wing with three fighter squadrons (F-15 aircraft), an air control squadron (E-3 aircraft), and airlift squadron (C-12 and C-130 aircraft); an Air Force Intelligence Command electronic security group; Alaskan NORAD Region Operations Center; and a USAF medical center.											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:		0									
b. Water pollution:		0									
c. Occupational safety and health:		0									
d. Other Environmental:		0									

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
AIR FORCE						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION				4. PROJECT TITLE		
ELMENDORF AIR FORCE BASE, ALASKA				CORROSION CONTROL FACILITY		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT		6. CATEGORY CODE	7. PROJECT NUMBER		8. PROJECT COST(\$000)	
1.28.96		211-159	FXSB923410		5,975	
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
CORROSION CONTROL FACILITY		SF	24,000		5,100	
MAINTENANCE/MANAGEMENT AREA		SF	22,000	220	(4,840)	
UNHEATED HAZARDOUS WASTE STORAGE		SF	2,000	130	(260)	
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					315	
UTILITIES		LS			(140)	
PAVEMENTS		LS			(60)	
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(90)	
COMMUNICATIONS SUPPORT		LS			(25)	
SUBTOTAL					5,415	
CONTINGENCY (5%)					271	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					5,686	
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6.5%)					370	
TOTAL REQUEST					6,056	
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					5,975	
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Construct a corrosion control facility to include areas for aircraft and support equipment touch-up, paint removal and spray booths, paint chemical stripping, maintenance oversight and storage. Includes environmental features such as diking, drain with separators and tank, and ventilation. Airfield and vehicle parking pavements, fire protection and all necessary support.						
11. REQUIREMENT: 40,250 SF ADEQUATE: 2,315 SF SUBSTANDARD: 41,461 SF PROJECT: Construct a corrosion control facility. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: An adequate facility, properly sized and configured, for stripping, cleaning and painting of aircraft parts and support equipment, and aircraft touch-up for F-15 and C-130 aircraft. Complete repainting is performed on 30-month average rotational schedule at the regional corrosion control facility at Eielson AFB. However, aircraft parts and support equipment must be painted locally and touch-up painting of aircraft is necessary to treat mildly corroded aircraft sections. Cleaning agents, treatment chemicals, and paint must be applied in a controlled, safe environment and be disposed of in accordance with environmental requirements. CURRENT SITUATION: The current corrosion control facility is a former hangar, wood construction built in 1944, which lacks essential systems and features to meet EPA, OSHA, State of Alaska and the Municipality of Anchorage (MoA) requirements. The inadequate ventilation system is unable to prevent unsafe accumulation of toxic and explosive vapor mixtures as determined by 49 CFR 1910.106(d). It exposes personnel to high levels of toxic materials including methyl ethyl ketone, zinc chromate, isocyanate and lead. The lead exposure risk has been assigned a RAC 2(IIB). There is an open ECAMP finding for lack of spill containment dikes, and drains						

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	.FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ELMENDORF AIR FORCE BASE, ALASKA		
4. PROJECT TITLE CORROSION CONTROL FACILITY	5. PROJECT NUMBER FXSB923410	
<p>which discharge into the sanitary sewer, violating 40 CFR 403.4-.5 and MoA's Industrial Wastewater Permit #11. There is not adequate fire suppression required by 29 CFR 1910.159 and fire codes. The electrical system and fixtures are not explosion proof. The facility is operating under a waiver for the twelve flammable storage lockers inside the facility, needed to keep a minimum working quantity of paints and solvents on hand. The climate at Elmendorf AFB is unsuitable for corrosion control in an unsheltered area. Temperature extremes interfere with paint drying, which requires 60-90 degrees F. Even when hangar doors can be opened for ventilation during the summer, there are severe problems with dust on newly painted surfaces. The existing conditions in this facility create fire, safety and environmental hazards which demand an adequate solution.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Personnel will continue to operate in a hazardous and toxic workplace. The threat of possible air and water contamination to the environment will continue. If the facility must close due to these impacts then aircraft and support equipment will not receive the required corrosion protection, thus decreasing their lifespan. Increasing visits by the aircraft to the regional corrosion facility, even if possible, is expensive and reduces mission availability.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> The regional corrosion control facility at Eielson AFB is operating at maximum capacity, according to a recent letter from the commander, and cannot process more than the one Elmendorf aircraft per month. This situation will be aggravated by imminent Eielson and Elmendorf AFB mission increases. An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of new construction, revitalization, sharing Eielson's facilities and status quo operation. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, new construction was found to be the most cost efficient over the life of the project. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements".</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																																													
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ELMENDORF AIR FORCE BASE, ALASKA																																															
4. PROJECT TITLE CORROSION CONTROL FACILITY	5. PROJECT NUMBER FXSB923410																																														
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td colspan="3">(1) Status:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td></td> <td>92 JUL 24</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td></td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td></td> <td>92 OCT 31</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td></td> <td>93 JUL 11</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(2) Basis:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td></td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td></td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td></td> <td>329</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td></td> <td>159</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td></td> <td>488</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> <td>334</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td></td> <td>154</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(4) Construction Start</td> <td></td> <td>94 JAN</td> </tr> </table> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(1) Status:			(a) Date Design Started		92 JUL 24	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%	(c) Date 35% Designed		92 OCT 31	(d) Date Design Complete		93 JUL 11	(2) Basis:			(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A	(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)			(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		329	(b) All Other Design Costs		159	(c) Total		488	(d) Contract		334	(e) In-house		154	(4) Construction Start		94 JAN
(1) Status:																																															
(a) Date Design Started		92 JUL 24																																													
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%																																													
(c) Date 35% Designed		92 OCT 31																																													
(d) Date Design Complete		93 JUL 11																																													
(2) Basis:																																															
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO																																													
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A																																													
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)																																															
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		329																																													
(b) All Other Design Costs		159																																													
(c) Total		488																																													
(d) Contract		334																																													
(e) In-house		154																																													
(4) Construction Start		94 JAN																																													

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ELMENDORF AIR FORCE BASE, ALASKA		4. PROJECT TITLE MUNITIONS MAINTENANCE FACILITY		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 2.80.30P	6. CATEGORY CODE 216-642	7. PROJECT NUMBER FXSB890421	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 2,100	
9. COST ESTIMATES				
ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
MUNITIONS MAINTENANCE FACILITY	SF	6,000	220	1,320
SUPPORTING FACILITIES				565
UTILITIES	LS			(160)
PAVEMENTS	LS			(90)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS	LS			(175)
FIRE PROTECTION	LS			(85)
DEMOLITION	SF	3,950	14	(55)
SUBTOTAL				1,565
CONTINGENCY (5%)				94
TOTAL CONTRACT COST				1,979
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6.5%)				129
TOTAL REQUEST				2,108
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)				2,100
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Reinforced concrete foundation, concrete walls, and a built-up roofing system. Project includes maintenance bays, specialized doors, hoist system, compressed air, lightning protection, security fencing and lighting, access pavement, 3000 SF equipment pad and all necessary utilities and support. Demolishes existing facility.				
11. REQUIREMENT: 6,000 SF ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 3,950 SF <u>PROJECT:</u> Construct a munitions maintenance facility. (New Mission) <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> A facility is required to perform various simultaneous munitions operations involving assembly, maintenance, corrosion control and Time Compliance Technical Orders (TCTO) tasks for various F-15 munitions, components and containers. Facility is also required to provide munitions maintenance support for the newly assigned F-15E aircraft and its associated inert and "smart" weapons. <u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> The existing conventional munitions shop is not adequate in size to allow more than one munition operation at a time. Nor is the installed equipment capable of meeting mission needs. Facility is located in an area requiring explosive safety waivers. Net Explosive Weight limitations greatly restrict the use of munitions required for support of F-15C/D and E aircraft. The requirements for TDY aircraft cannot be adequately supported under present conditions. These missions drive dissimilar munitions requirements that must be prepared simultaneously; however, simultaneous munitions preparation cannot be performed in the existing facility. Restricted height clearances, small access door (8' X 11') and limited drive through capability prevent the offloading of munitions trailers within the existing facility. Consequently, all munitions offloading must be done outside, in the harsh				

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ELMENDORF AIR FORCE BASE, ALASKA		
4. PROJECT TITLE MUNITIONS MAINTENANCE FACILITY	5. PROJECT NUMBER FXSB890421	
<p>arctic environment. Munitions are then transferred to smaller trailers capable of entering the facility. Lack of a hoist requires hand carrying of numerous heavy munitions components within operating bays. Compressed air is not available to support the Automatic Loading System trailers. The existing facility's load bearing wall configuration and the munitions bay height will not permit alteration of the facility to meet mission needs. The facility is isolated from other munitions functions which delays delivery time and hampers command and control. The current munitions shop is sited within the 1,000 foot primary clearance zone of the north/south runway and is too close to non-munitions facilities. It is located just 600 feet from the non-DOD owned Alaska Railroad train track.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Continued handling of explosive ordinance in a facility which does not meet minimum standards for safety could lead to a disaster and great loss of life. From an operational perspective, timely support of assigned and transient aircraft will not be met with the required effectiveness. This will delay various aircraft on the ramp as they await munitions. Without relocating the facility to join the missile shop, munitions management, and munitions igloo facilities, command and control over munitions functions is hampered. Securing the munition resources will remain inefficient and difficult.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements". A preliminary analysis of reasonable options for accomplishing this project (status quo, repair and replacement construction) was done. It indicates there is only one option which meets explosive safety and mission requirements. Because of this, a full economic analysis was not performed. A certificate of exclusion has been prepared.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	.FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ELMENDORF AIR FORCE BASE, ALASKA																								
4. PROJECT TITLE MUNITIONS MAINTENANCE FACILITY	5. PROJECT NUMBER FXSB890421																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="379 638 1428 776"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 JUL 24</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 OCT 31</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 JUL 11</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="379 829 1346 904"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="379 957 1428 1127"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>105</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>69</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>174</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>105</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>69</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 JAN</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 JUL 24	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 OCT 31	(d) Date Design Complete	93 JUL 11	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	105	(b) All Other Design Costs	69	(c) Total	174	(d) Contract	105	(e) In-house	69
(a) Date Design Started	92 JUL 24																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 OCT 31																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 JUL 11																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	105																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	69																							
(c) Total	174																							
(d) Contract	105																							
(e) In-house	69																							

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
AIR FORCE						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION				4. PROJECT TITLE		
ELMENDORF AIR FORCE BASE, ALASKA				MUNITIONS EQUIPMENT FACILITY		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT		6. CATEGORY CODE	7. PROJECT NUMBER		8. PROJECT COST(\$000)	
2.80.30P		422-275	FXSB923411		1,860	
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
MUNITIONS EQUIPMENT FACILITY		SF	2,700	240	648	
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					1,015	
UTILITIES		LS			(55)	
PAVEMENTS		LS			(370)	
SITE IMPROVEMENTS/SECURITY FENCING		LS			(570)	
COMMUNICATIONS SUPPORT		LS			(20)	
SUBTOTAL					1,663	
CONTINGENCY (5%)					83	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					1,746	
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6.5%)					113	
TOTAL REQUEST					1,859	
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					1,860	
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Concrete foundation and floor slab over non-frost susceptible soil, concrete block walls, membrane assembly roof system. Includes security lighting, utilities, fire protection and all necessary support.						
11. REQUIREMENT: 2,700 SF ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 0 PROJECT: Construct a munitions equipment facility. (New Mission) REQUIREMENT: A facility is required for the maintenance, inspection and refurbishment of 142 munitions handling trailers and over 1,000 pieces of smaller support equipment. Trailers are used to transport all explosives, including missiles, ready munitions and equipment. Fencing is required to secure the facility and incorporate it into the munitions storage area. CURRENT SITUATION: The arctic environment decreases trailer reliability/service life and increases all equipment maintenance requirements. The current munitions equipment maintenance function does not possess a dedicated, adequate facility for performing maintenance on the large fleet of trailers and support equipment. An interim facility will be available under authority of DODI 4165.56 until 1994 and provides minimum space, weather protection for maintenance personnel and storage for tools and support equipment. However, it falls far short of space, installed equipment, and basic amenities to support the trailer fleet and maintenance personnel. The interim facility is isolated from other munitions functions, which delays delivery and hampers command and control. IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: Without this project, munitions support equipment maintenance will be degraded. Service life of these assets will be greatly reduced. The ability to support munition taskings is lessened. This project is needed to achieve efficiencies to get the current job done						

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ELMENDORF AIR FORCE BASE, ALASKA		
4. PROJECT TITLE MUNITIONS EQUIPMENT FACILITY	5. PROJECT NUMBER FXSB923411	
<p>with reduced manning.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL</u>: There was no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in AFM 86-2 "Standard Facility Requirements".</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	.FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ELMENDORF AIR FORCE BASE, ALASKA																								
4. PROJECT TITLE MUNITIONS EQUIPMENT FACILITY	5. PROJECT NUMBER FXSB923411																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="373 640 1442 766"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 JUL 24</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>93 JAN 29</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 NOV 30</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="373 829 1442 892"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="373 955 1442 1123"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>105</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>69</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>174</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>105</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>69</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 FEB</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 JUL 24	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	93 JAN 29	(d) Date Design Complete	93 NOV 30	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	105	(b) All Other Design Costs	69	(c) Total	174	(d) Contract	105	(e) In-house	69
(a) Date Design Started	92 JUL 24																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	93 JAN 29																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 NOV 30																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	105																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	69																							
(c) Total	174																							
(d) Contract	105																							
(e) In-house	69																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ELMENDORF AIR FORCE BASE, ALASKA		4. PROJECT TITLE HAZARDOUS WASTE STORAGE FACILITY		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 2.74.56P	6. CATEGORY CODE 442-257	7. PROJECT NUMBER FXSB933012	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 3,900	

9. COST ESTIMATES				
ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
HAZARDOUS WASTE STORAGE FACILITY	SF	20,000	135	2,700
SUPPORTING FACILITIES				795
UTILITIES	LS			(175)
PAVEMENTS	LS			(205)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS	LS			(135)
FIRE SUPPRESSION	LS			(80)
DEMOLITION/ASBESTOS DISPOSAL	SF	19,800	10	(200)
SUBTOTAL				3,495
CONTINGENCY (5%)				175
TOTAL CONTRACT COST				3,670
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6.5%)				239
TOTAL REQUEST				3,909
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)				3,900

10. Description of Proposed Construction: Construct a hazardous waste storage warehouse meeting all environmental and life/safety codes. Contains open bay and secure covered storage with fire walls, exterior shed storage, management and support space. Includes ventilation, alarm system, entry control, drainage to containment tank, diking, fire protection and other necessary support. Demolish old building.

11. REQUIREMENT: 42,453 SF ADEQUATE: 21,410 SF SUBSTANDARD: 20,843 SF
PROJECT: Construct a hazardous waste storage facility. (Current Mission)
REQUIREMENT: This is a level I environmental compliance requirement. An EPA permitted facility is needed for the accumulation and storage of hazardous waste prior to turn in to the Defense Reutilization and Marketing Office (DRMO) for disposal. Hazardous wastes cannot be turned in for disposal until minimum quantity is stockpiled, segregated, containerized and marked correctly on mandated tags and forms. Elmendorf AFB has the only Treatment, Storage, and Disposal Facility (TSDF) license in the Anchorage area.
CURRENT SITUATION: The current facility was built in 1944 and has not received a major renovation since. The current facility lacks essential systems/features to meet EPA and OSHA requirements for the operation of a TSDF. The facility does not have floor drains which connect to a holding tank in case of spills. The facility lacks alarm systems to provide immediate emergency evacuation instruction to personnel in case of spill. The container storage area doesn't allow for proper segregation of incompatible wastes. The container storage area does not have spill containment diking. The fire suppression systems do not meet standards for TSDF operations. Fire walls are needed to segregate storage areas and obtain maximum use of storage space. The facility lacks a ventilation

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ELMENDORF AIR FORCE BASE, ALASKA		
4. PROJECT TITLE HAZARDOUS WASTE STORAGE FACILITY	5. PROJECT NUMBER FXSB933012	
<p>system providing necessary air changes to prevent the accumulation of toxic or explosive vapor mixtures. The electrical system does not meet National Electrical Code requirements for the storage of flammables and combustibles and needs to be upgraded. The facility is not insulated nor has the exterior siding been upgraded since original construction. Insulation and new siding will prevent heat loss and possible freezing of materials during the winter months. This facility is required to restrict and monitor entry. The existing fence is not adequate for appropriate vehicle, pedestrian or fire lane access. Some interim improvements have been made, however, further investment to upgrade the existing facility is not wise since building's useful life has been exceeded. Replacement of the current inadequate facility, with one meeting all codes and standards, is needed.</p> <p>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: Workers would continue to operate in a high health risk workplace. Also, failure to resolve the regulatory deficiencies could result in EPA not renewing the existing permit. This facility is one of few permitted TSDFs in the State, with most hazardous waste generated by USAF bases and other DoD installations in Alaska shipping to this facility. Failure to retain the permit could subject Elmendorf AFB and other DoD installations to notices of violations, legal action and fines from EPA for exceeding allowable storage time limits for hazardous waste. Without a facility, waste would require quick transport, normally airlift, in small quantities and high expense to lower 48 states.</p> <p>ADDITIONAL: There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements". A preliminary analysis of reasonable options for accomplishing this project (status quo, repair and replacement construction) was done. It indicates there is only one option that satisfies statutory requirements. Because of this, a full economic analysis was not performed. A certificate of exclusion has been prepared.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ELMENDORF AIR FORCE BASE, ALASKA																								
4. PROJECT TITLE HAZARDOUS WASTE STORAGE FACILITY	5. PROJECT NUMBER FXSB933012																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="376 625 1445 756"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 JUL 24</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>93 JAN 06</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 OCT 01</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="376 823 1445 886"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="376 949 1445 1108"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>181</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>140</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>321</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>167</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>154</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 JAN</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 JUL 24	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	93 JAN 06	(d) Date Design Complete	93 OCT 01	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	181	(b) All Other Design Costs	140	(c) Total	321	(d) Contract	167	(e) In-house	154
(a) Date Design Started	92 JUL 24																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	93 JAN 06																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 OCT 01																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	181																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	140																							
(c) Total	321																							
(d) Contract	167																							
(e) In-house	154																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ELMENDORF AIR FORCE BASE, ALASKA		4. PROJECT TITLE DINING FACILITY		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 1.28.96	6. CATEGORY CODE 722-351	7. PROJECT NUMBER FXSB943003R1	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 6,800	
9. COST ESTIMATES				
ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
DINING FACILITY	SF	20,000	240	4,800
SUPPORTING FACILITIES				1,240
UTILITIES	LS			(250)
PAVEMENTS	LS			(290)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS	LS			(350)
COMMUNICATIONS SUPPORT	LS			(145)
EMERGENCY GENERATORS	LS			(205)
SUBTOTAL				6,640
CONTINGENCY (5%)				302
TOTAL CONTRACT COST				6,342
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6.5%)				412
TOTAL REQUEST				6,754
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)				6,800
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Reinforced concrete foundation and floor slab, masonry walls, roof system, fire protection, and all necessary support. Includes dining and serving areas, kitchen, storage, freezer/chill space, receiving and support space.				
11. REQUIREMENT: 40,900 SF ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 27,251 SF PROJECT: Construct a dining facility. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: An adequate dining facility to properly feed assigned and transient unaccompanied enlisted personnel. The food service personnel need functionally-arranged and properly-equipped food preparation areas, adequate servicing space, and food equipment storage space. CURRENT SITUATION: The existing main dining facility is a masonry structure built in 1952. At only 13,774 square feet, it is grossly undersized to accommodate the number of permanent party and transient enlisted personnel performing duty at Elmendorf Air Force Base. All of the utility systems to support the dining operation are old, under capacity to meet current load/demand, and require excessive maintenance. The alignment and grade of the access road is too steep for deliveries during the winter season. The existing facility is part of the billeting office/transient dormitory, which precludes economical addition to and renovation of the building. Due to the large deficiency of airmen recreational facilities and the convenience of the existing dining hall to airmen dormitories, this facility will be converted to a recreation center facility with a future O&M project. Of the other two dining facilities at Elmendorf, one serves a remote communications site only, and the other requires upgrade with a future O&M project. Addition or alteration of these other dining halls is not a satisfactory alternative since they are distant from the dormitories and area of base that this dining hall				

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	,FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ELMENDORF AIR FORCE BASE, ALASKA		
4. PROJECT TITLE DINING FACILITY	5. PROJECT NUMBER FXSB943003R1	
<p>replacement serves. Due to weather conditions and vastness of this large base, a single consolidated facility would not adequately serve the enlisted population.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Continued use of an inadequate facility that is too small to accommodate the current demand. The sanitation and safety problems, deteriorating utilities, and other discrepancies will continue to degrade food service and adversely affect employee and patron morale.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of new construction, addition/alteration, and status quo operation. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, new construction was found to be the most cost effective over the life of the project. This project meets the criteria/scope specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide".</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	.FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ELMENDORF AIR FORCE BASE, ALASKA																								
4. PROJECT TITLE DINING FACILITY	5. PROJECT NUMBER FXSB943003R1																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="371 619 1437 766"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 JUL 24</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>93 JAN 26</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 NOV 01</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="371 819 1437 892"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="371 945 1437 1113"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>363</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>183</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>546</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>373</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>173</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 MAR</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 JUL 24	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	93 JAN 26	(d) Date Design Complete	93 NOV 01	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	363	(b) All Other Design Costs	183	(c) Total	546	(d) Contract	373	(e) In-house	173
(a) Date Design Started	92 JUL 24																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	93 JAN 26																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 NOV 01																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	363																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	183																							
(c) Total	546																							
(d) Contract	373																							
(e) In-house	173																							

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)		2. DATE	
AIR FORCE					
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION			4. PROJECT TITLE		
ELMENDORF AIR FORCE BASE, ALASKA			CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT	6. CATEGORY CODE	7. PROJECT NUMBER	8. PROJECT COST(\$000)		
2.75.96P	740-884	FXSB953002R1	5,070		
9. COST ESTIMATES					
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER		SF	22,900	170	3,893
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					640
UTILITIES		LS			(235)
PAVEMENTS		LS			(130)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(185)
PLAYGROUND EQUIPMENT		LS			(70)
FENCING		LS			(20)
SUBTOTAL					4,533
CONTINGENCY (5%)					227
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					4,760
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6.5%)					309
TOTAL REQUEST					5,069
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					5,070
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Concrete foundation and floor slab, concrete block walls, and built-up roof. Work includes all utilities, pavements, fire protection, environmental clean-up, playground and other necessary support.					
11. REQUIREMENT: 83,850 SF ADEQUATE: 12,368 SF SUBSTANDARD: 1,674 SF <u>PROJECT:</u> Construct a child development center. (Current Mission) <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> An adequate facility to provide supervised care and developmental experiences for over 300 dependent children aged six weeks through ten years. The child development center must provide a comfortable, clean, educational environment where servicemen and women can leave their children on an hourly, daily, or drop-in basis without worrying about the level or nature of care. <u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> The existing child development facilities directly support an average of 526 children daily (180 children are cared for in the primary facility, while care is temporarily provided for 36 children in the Arts & Crafts Center, 170 children in an old barracks, and 140 children in the Orion & Aurora Schools). Children must be turned away because even these work arounds are inadequate to accommodate the demand (423 children are on the waiting list and 406 children are cared for in private homes on base). Infant and toddler areas are especially undersized. The addition of a F-15E mission will aggravate the child care shortfall. The military readiness of married and single parent personnel assigned is dependent upon readily available child care, which enables military members to participate in alerts, training exercises and other mission demands. Hours of operation of on-base child care can support contingency demands. The high cost of living in Alaska often requires both spouses to work, forcing a higher than national average of families					

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	.FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ELMENDORF AIR FORCE BASE, ALASKA		
4. PROJECT TITLE CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	5. PROJECT NUMBER FXSB953002R1	
<p>to send their children to child care. Off-base child care facilities are extremely expensive (twice on-base rates).</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Mission readiness is affected because eligible military parents will continue to be denied basic child care needs and development services. Personnel will be forced to use scarce and expensive off-base services. The lack of affordable and quality child care results in undue hardship on military families. Over the long term, the consequences are detrimental to productivity, motivation and ultimately career retention.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> The balance of this requirement will be addressed in future MILCON projects. An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of new construction, revitalization and status quo operation. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, new construction was found to be the most cost efficient over the life of the project. This project meets the criteria/scope specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide".</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	.FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																																													
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ELMENDORF AIR FORCE BASE, ALASKA																																															
4. PROJECT TITLE CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	5. PROJECT NUMBER FXSB953002R1																																														
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td colspan="3">(1) Status:</td> </tr> <tr> <td> (a) Date Design Started</td> <td></td> <td>92 JUL 24</td> </tr> <tr> <td> (b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td></td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td> (c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td></td> <td>92 OCT 20</td> </tr> <tr> <td> (d) Date Design Complete</td> <td></td> <td>93 NOV 19</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(2) Basis:</td> </tr> <tr> <td> (a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td></td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td> (b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td></td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</td> </tr> <tr> <td> (a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td></td> <td>310</td> </tr> <tr> <td> (b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td></td> <td>155</td> </tr> <tr> <td> (c) Total</td> <td></td> <td>465</td> </tr> <tr> <td> (d) Contract</td> <td></td> <td>90</td> </tr> <tr> <td> (e) In-house</td> <td></td> <td>375</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(4) Construction Start</td> <td></td> <td>94 APR</td> </tr> </table> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(1) Status:			(a) Date Design Started		92 JUL 24	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%	(c) Date 35% Designed		92 OCT 20	(d) Date Design Complete		93 NOV 19	(2) Basis:			(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A	(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)			(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		310	(b) All Other Design Costs		155	(c) Total		465	(d) Contract		90	(e) In-house		375	(4) Construction Start		94 APR
(1) Status:																																															
(a) Date Design Started		92 JUL 24																																													
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%																																													
(c) Date 35% Designed		92 OCT 20																																													
(d) Date Design Complete		93 NOV 19																																													
(2) Basis:																																															
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO																																													
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A																																													
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)																																															
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		310																																													
(b) All Other Design Costs		155																																													
(c) Total		465																																													
(d) Contract		90																																													
(e) In-house		375																																													
(4) Construction Start		94 APR																																													

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE			
AIR FORCE								
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION				4. PROJECT TITLE				
ELMENDORF AIR FORCE BASE, ALASKA				ADD TO SANITARY SEWER SYSTEM				
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT		6. CATEGORY CODE	7. PROJECT NUMBER		8. PROJECT COST(\$000)			
2.74.56P		832-266	FXSB870404		5,100			
9. COST ESTIMATES								
ITEM					U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
ADD TO SANITARY SEWER SYSTEM					LF	17,700	160	2,832
SUPPORTING FACILITIES								1,705
LIFT STATIONS/MANHOLES/CONNECTION					LS			(765)
INDUSTRIAL PRE-TREATMENT PLANT					LS			(560)
ROAD/CREEK CROSSING					LS			(260)
SUPPORT UTILITIES					LS			(50)
OIL/WATER SEPARATORS					LS			(70)
SUBTOTAL								4,537
CONTINGENCY (5%)								227
TOTAL CONTRACT COST								4,764
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6.5%)								310
TOTAL REQUEST								5,074
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)								5,100
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Extend sanitary sewer system to flightline operations area. Includes sewer mains, lift station, pressure relief stations, industrial pre-treatment plant, building connections, oil/water separators, utilities and all necessary support.								
11. REQUIREMENT: 375,954 LF ADEQUATE: 358,254 LF SUBSTANDARD: 0 PROJECT: Add to sanitary sewer system. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: This is a level I environmental compliance requirement. A sanitary sewer line and industrial treatment plant are needed to provide efficient removal and treatment of large quantities of industrial wastewater/human sewage from a flightline operations area that includes two hangers, a storage building, a missile maintenance shop, and an aircraft wash area. Further development of the area is planned to support the beddown of the new F-15E squadron in FY92. CURRENT SITUATION: This base area has no sewer lines and all wastewater is treated via septic systems and returned to the aquifer through a trench drain leach field. Most of the remaining base has sewer lines emptying into the Municipality of Anchorage sewer system. This area is out of compliance with State wastewater treatment regulations. Extensive development for F-15E support and other facilities is planned due to base topography making it the only open area with access to flightline. It is expected that additional human sewage loading will exceed the capacity of the area for septic tank treatment of wastewater, violating the Clean Water Act. Solvents, oils and greases migrate into the septic systems in this industrial area despite preventative efforts. Management procedures are in-place to reduce the severity, but industrial wastewater discharge due to aircraft cleaning operations and minor leaks is unavoidable. Discharge of industrial waste into leach fields violates 18 AAC 75 and								

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	.FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ELMENDORF AIR FORCE BASE, ALASKA		
4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO SANITARY SEWER SYSTEM	5. PROJECT NUMBER FXSB870404	
<p>should be treated in accordance with 18 AAC 72.210. Two leach fields in this area are Installation Restoration Program (IRP) sites now being cleaned up due to these problems. With F-15E beddown, expanded maintenance activities will generate significant increases of industrial and human wastewater. The lack of a sewer system prevents the appropriate treatment of wastewater and puts Elmendorf AFB out of compliance with Federal and State regulations.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Industrial and human sewage wastewater will not be treated in accordance with established environmental statutes. The increased industrial waste water/sewage generated by F-15E maintenance and operations activities will overtax the existing septic system, polluting the environment and possibly making Elmendorf AFB open for notices of violation, fines and legal action.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements". An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of new construction, service contract, and status quo operation. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, new construction was found to be the most cost efficient over the life of the project.</p>		

1. COMPONENT	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
AIR FORCE		
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION		
ELMENDORF AIR FORCE BASE, ALASKA		
4. PROJECT TITLE		5. PROJECT NUMBER
ADD TO SANITARY SEWER SYSTEM		FXSB870404
12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:		
a. Estimated Design Data:		
(1) Status:		
(a) Date Design Started		92 JUL 24
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%
(c) Date 35% Designed		93 JAN 29
(d) Date Design Complete		94 FEB 27
(2) Basis:		
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)		
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		285
(b) All Other Design Costs		148
(c) Total		433
(d) Contract		295
(e) In-house		138
(4) Construction Start		94 JUL
b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A		

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)								2. DATE	
AIR FORCE											
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION				4. COMMAND				5. AREA CONST COST INDEX			
DAVIS-MONTHAN AIR FORCE BASE, ARIZONA				AIR COMBAT COMMAND				0.90			
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			TOTAL
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	
a. As of 30 SEP 92		548	3995	1338	88	381		1	2	17	6,370
b. End FY 1998		746	4145	1408	88	381		1	2	17	6,788
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (10,983)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)		250,398									
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:		13,600									
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:		650									
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)		2,800									
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:		15,338									
g. Remaining Deficiency:		0									
h. Grand Total:		282,786									
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE		SCOPE		COST (\$000)		DESIGN START		STATUS Cmpl	
CODE											
411-135		UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS		LS		650		NOV 92		AUG 93	
				TOTAL:		650					
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995)											
211-159		CORROSION CONTROL FACILITY		SF		2,800					
				TOTAL:		2,800					
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
116-662		DANGEROUS CARGO PAD		SY		4,900					
116-665		POWER CHECK PAD W/NOISE SUP		EA		740					
216-642		ADD TO AND ALTER CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS SHOP		SF		647					
740-674		PHYSICAL FITNESS CENTER		SF		4,079					
911-146		LAND, FEE, PURCHASE		AC		1,600					
10. Mission or Major Functions: A flying wing with two fighter training squadrons responsible for training all A-10 aircrews; two air control squadrons (OA-10 aircraft), and two electronic combat squadrons (EC-130 aircraft); an Air Force Reserve special operations squadron (HH-3 helicopters); an Air National Guard fighter interceptor detachment (F-16 aircraft); and Air Force Materiel Command's Aerospace Maintenance and Regeneration Center.											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:		0									
b. Water pollution:		0									
c. Occupational safety and health:		0									
d. Other Environmental:		0									

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)					2. DATE				
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION LUKE AIR FORCE BASE, ARIZONA			4. COMMAND AIR COMBAT COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX 0.95					
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED		TOTAL	
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL		CIV
a. As of 30 SEP 92		546	3689	1078	244	45	8	1	18	3	5,632
b. End FY 1998		641	5126	1085	244	45	8	1	18	3	7,171
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (7,249)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92) 242,096											
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory: 2,950											
d. Authorization Requested In This Program: 6,750											
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995) 0											
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years: 9,777											
g. Remaining Deficiency: 0											
h. Grand Total: 261,573											
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE		SCOPE		COST (\$000)		DESIGN STATUS			
CODE								START		CMP	
179-511		FIRE TRAINING FACILITY		1 EA		800		JUL 92		JUN 93	
411-135		UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS		LS		1,250					
722-351		DINING FACILITY		27,900 SF		4,700		APR 89		AUG 93	
						TOTAL:		6,750			
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995) NONE											
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
171-152		ACADEMIC LECTURE HALL		12,000 SF		2,727					
216-642		MUNITIONS MAINTENANCE FACILITY		12,000 SF		1,800					
740-674		ADD TO AND ALTER PHYSICAL FITNESS CENTER		26,000 SF		3,000					
880-211		CLOSED HEAD AUTO SPRINKLER		124,000 SF		2,250					
10. Mission or Major Functions: A fighter wing with three F-16 squadrons and two F-15E squadrons tht are responsible for training all F-16 and F-15E aircrews; and an Air Force Reserve fighter group (F-16 aircraft).											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (C) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution: 0											
b. Water pollution: 0											
c. Occupational safety and health: 0											
d. Other Environmental: 0											

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)				2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION LUKE AIR FORCE BASE, ARIZONA				4. PROJECT TITLE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 2.74.56C		6. CATEGORY CODE 411-135	7. PROJECT NUMBER NUEX923017		8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 1,250		
9. COST ESTIMATES							
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)		
UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS		LS			1,045		
REMOVE TANKS		EA	14	59,500	(833)		
REPLACE TANKS		EA	13	16,310	(212)		
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					25		
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(15)		
PAVEMENTS		LS			(10)		
SUBTOTAL					1,070		
CONTINGENCY (10%)					107		
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					1,177		
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					71		
TOTAL REQUEST					1,248		
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					1,250		
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Excavate 14 underground storage tanks (USTs) of 100-50,000 gallon capacity. Remove and dispose of tank sludge residue. Replace 13 with aboveground tanks. Project includes release prevention and detection, corrosion protection, site improvements, paving, remediation of contamination, and other necessary support.							
11. REQUIREMENT: As required. PROJECT: Remove/replace underground storage tanks (USTs). (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: This is a Level II environmental compliance project. Adequate fuel storage, properly designed and located, is required to satisfy base mission requirements. All petroleum dispensing and operating facilities must be provided with a means for detecting and preventing release of pollutants into the surrounding environment. All USTs must be upgraded in accordance with federal law (40 CFR 280.21) by December 1998. This includes leak detection, corrosion protection, and spill/overflow prevention systems to protect human health and the environment. CURRENT SITUATION: Underground storage tanks at Luke AFB do not meet federal requirements for corrosion protection, secondary containment, and overfill/spill protection. The condition of these tanks varies with a majority of the tanks at or exceeding their design life. These deficiencies must be corrected to prevent violation of federal UST regulations. If underground storage tanks require replacement, Air Force policy is to replace them with aboveground tanks or relocate them into underground vaults, whenever possible. IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: Undetected UST releases can result in contamination of soil and ground water supplies, resulting in a threat to human health and the environment along with extremely costly cleanup							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	.FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION LUKE AIR FORCE BASE, ARIZONA		
4. PROJECT TITLE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	5. PROJECT NUMBER NUEX923017	
<p>measures. These improvements to USTs are mandated by federal law. If not accomplished by the established deadline, the base will be in violation of the law and subject to receiving Notices of Violation, fines and significant adverse publicity.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements".</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE				
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION LUKE AIR FORCE BASE, ARIZONA						
4. PROJECT TITLE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	5. PROJECT NUMBER NUEX923017					
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Project to be accomplished by one step turn key procedures</p> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="379 693 1354 766"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Design Allowance 50</p> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO					
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A					

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
AIR FORCE						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION			4. PROJECT TITLE			
LUKE AIR FORCE BASE, ARIZONA			DINING FACILITY			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT		6. CATEGORY CODE	7. PROJECT NUMBER	8. PROJECT COST(\$000)		
2.75.96C		722-351	NUEX883005	4,700		
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
DINING FACILITY		SF	27,900	128	3,435	
AIRMAN DINING HALL (DETACHED)		SF	17,200	140	(2,408)	
TROOP SUBSISTENCE WAREHOUSE		SF	5,000	96	(480)	
LINEN EXCH, POSTAL CNTR & MECH ROOMS		SF	5,700	96	(547)	
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					805	
UTILITIES		LS			(190)	
SITE IMPROVEMENT		LS			(190)	
PAVEMENTS		SY	5,000	34	(170)	
ASBESTOS REMOVAL		SF	14,900	10	(150)	
DEMOLITION		SF	20,900	5	(105)	
SUBTOTAL					4,240	
CONTINGENCY (5%)					212	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					4,452	
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					267	
TOTAL REQUEST					4,719	
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					4,700	
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Work includes spread footings and foundation wall, concrete floor, masonry walls, roof joists, and roof system. Facility includes dining area, kitchen, serving area, dishwashing area, bakery, regular and troop issue storage, office, latrines and receiving area. Project includes demolition, utilities and necessary support. Air Conditioning: 120 Tons.						
11. REQUIREMENT: 27,900 SF ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 22,979 SF PROJECT: Construct dining hall, troop issue, postal service center and linen exchange. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: An adequately sized and configured dining facility is required to properly feed assigned and transient unaccompanied enlisted personnel. To attract and retain competent, professional enlisted personnel, the dining facility must provide a pleasant atmosphere. There must be adequate space for food preparation and dishwashing equipment, dining and food storage. The dining facility should include troop subsistence, linen exchange, and postal service center. This will provide a central facility where the enlisted personnel can make a single stop to eat, pickup and drop off linen, and pickup field rations and mail. CURRENT SITUATION: The existing dining hall is located in a substandard facility that cannot be altered or reconfigured and is the only such facility at Luke AFB. The facility is over 31 years old. Deteriorated, leaking water pipes have caused extensive damage to the facility and generate offensive odors. Air conditioning and heating is inadequate, inefficient and costly because of poor insulation and deteriorated weatherproofing of doors and windows. Air conditioning to the kitchen area is almost completely ineffective. The poor condition of the utility						

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	.FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION LUKE AIR FORCE BASE, ARIZONA		
4. PROJECT TITLE DINING FACILITY	5. PROJECT NUMBER NUEX883005	
<p>systems and the obsolete electrical system result in low water pressure and unstable electrical power. A grease trap located next to the entrance produces an extremely offensive smell. The condition of the facility does not provide an appropriate atmosphere for dining. Troop Issue is located a quarter of a mile from the dining hall, which forces inefficient use of manpower due to the double handling of food. Troop Issue is also located in a 20-year-old metal building that requires constant repairs. This building is also one of the most energy inefficient facilities on Luke AFB. Placing the postal service center and linen exchange in the dining hall will provide a one-stop central location for more convenient services. The one-stop central location for dining, troop subsistence, linen exchange, and postal center has been tried at Langley AFB as a pilot program and has been favorably received. This project will demolish 20,900 SF including the existing dining facility (14,884 SF) and the existing postal service center (6,016 SF).</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Low troop morale, in part from poor food service due to inadequate facilities, will adversely affect the performance of enlisted personnel supporting the training mission at Luke AFB. Airmen who live on base are not provided Basic Allowance for Subsistence (BAS) and are therefore expected to eat in the dining facility. We must provide them a pleasant atmosphere in which to eat.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> This project meets the criteria/scope specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of new construction, revitalization, leasing and status quo operation. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, new construction was found to be the most cost efficient over the life of the project.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	.FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																																													
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION LUKE AIR FORCE BASE, ARIZONA																																															
4. PROJECT TITLE DINING FACILITY	5. PROJECT NUMBER NUEX883005																																														
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td colspan="3">(1) Status:</td> </tr> <tr> <td> (a) Date Design Started</td> <td></td> <td>89 APR 21</td> </tr> <tr> <td> (b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td></td> <td>60%</td> </tr> <tr> <td> (c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td></td> <td>92 SEP 30</td> </tr> <tr> <td> (d) Date Design Complete</td> <td></td> <td>93 AUG 10</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(2) Basis:</td> </tr> <tr> <td> (a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td></td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td> (b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td></td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</td> </tr> <tr> <td> (a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td></td> <td>294</td> </tr> <tr> <td> (b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td></td> <td>98</td> </tr> <tr> <td> (c) Total</td> <td></td> <td>392</td> </tr> <tr> <td> (d) Contract</td> <td></td> <td>294</td> </tr> <tr> <td> (e) In-house</td> <td></td> <td>98</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(4) Construction Start</td> <td></td> <td>93 DEC</td> </tr> </table> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(1) Status:			(a) Date Design Started		89 APR 21	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		60%	(c) Date 35% Designed		92 SEP 30	(d) Date Design Complete		93 AUG 10	(2) Basis:			(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A	(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)			(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		294	(b) All Other Design Costs		98	(c) Total		392	(d) Contract		294	(e) In-house		98	(4) Construction Start		93 DEC
(1) Status:																																															
(a) Date Design Started		89 APR 21																																													
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		60%																																													
(c) Date 35% Designed		92 SEP 30																																													
(d) Date Design Complete		93 AUG 10																																													
(2) Basis:																																															
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO																																													
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A																																													
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)																																															
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		294																																													
(b) All Other Design Costs		98																																													
(c) Total		392																																													
(d) Contract		294																																													
(e) In-house		98																																													
(4) Construction Start		93 DEC																																													

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)					2. DATE			
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION NAVAJO ARMY DEPOT, ARIZONA				4. COMMAND		5. AREA CONST COST INDEX 0.00				
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED		TOTAL
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	
a. As of 30 SEP 92										
b. End FY 1998										
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)										
a. Total Acreage: (0)										
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92) 0										
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory: 0										
d. Authorization Requested In This Program: 7,250										
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995) 0										
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years: 0										
g. Remaining Deficiency: 0										
h. Grand Total: 7,250										
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994										
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE			SCOPE		COST (\$000)	DESIGN STATUS		
CODE								START		C MPL
422-264		ALTER MINUTEMAN II STORAGE FACILITIES			LS		7,250	SEP 92		MAR 93
							TOTAL:	7,250		
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995) NONE										
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:										
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:										
a. Air pollution: 0										
b. Water pollution: 0										
c. Occupational safety and health: 0										
d. Other Environmental: 0										

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)				2. DATE		
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION NAVAJO ARMY DEPOT, ARIZONA				4. PROJECT TITLE ALTER MINUTEMAN II STORAGE FACILITIES				
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 1.12.13		6. CATEGORY CODE 422-264	7. PROJECT NUMBER PAYZ941000		8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 7,250			
9. COST ESTIMATES								
ITEM					U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
ALTER MINUTEMAN II STORAGE FACILITIES					LS			5,000
SUPPORTING FACILITIES								1,200
UTILITIES					LS			(850)
PAVEMENTS					LS			(250)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS					LS			(100)
SUBTOTAL								6,200
CONTINGENCY (10%)								620
TOTAL CONTRACT COST								6,820
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)								409
TOTAL REQUEST								7,229
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)								7,250
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Renovate earth-covered concrete storage buildings. Work includes new electric service, door replacement, heating, lighting, an environmental monitoring system, access pavements and necessary support.								
11. REQUIREMENT: As required. <u>PROJECT:</u> Alter earth-covered igloos for Minuteman II storage. (New Mission) <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> Adequately sized and sited facilities are needed to store Minuteman II missile stages which will be deactivated as part of a downsizing of strategic delivery systems. Structural modifications to existing igloos are needed to provide access to the facilities. Heating and environmental controls are required to preserve the missiles during storage. Upgraded electrical power is required for the lighting, environmental, and security requirements of the igloos. <u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> The Minuteman II missile system is being deactivated. Adequate storage space, in terms of numbers and facility requirements, do not exist. Facilities at the Navajo Depot Facility are inadequate in terms of door size, electrical power and environmental controls. <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Deactivation of Minuteman II missile sites cannot be safely accomplished. If the missiles are stored in inadequate facilities, safety will be compromised and the missiles will degrade at an accelerated rate. <u>ADDITIONAL:</u> All known alternative options were considered during the development of this project. No reasonable option could meet the mission and explosive safety requirements; therefore, no economic analysis was needed or performed. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide".								

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION NAVAJO ARMY DEPOT, ARIZONA		
4. PROJECT TITLE ALTER MINUTEMAN II STORAGE FACILITIES	5. PROJECT NUMBER PAYZ941000	
<p>However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements".</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION NAVAJO ARMY DEPOT, ARIZONA																								
4. PROJECT TITLE ALTER MINUTEMAN II STORAGE FACILITIES	5. PROJECT NUMBER PAYZ941000																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="376 625 1445 756"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 SEP 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 SEP 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 MAR 20</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="376 823 1445 886"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>YES</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>NAVAJO</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="376 949 1445 1108"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>60</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>30</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 SEP 01	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 SEP 15	(d) Date Design Complete	93 MAR 20	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	YES	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	NAVAJO	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	30	(b) All Other Design Costs	30	(c) Total	60	(d) Contract	30	(e) In-house	30
(a) Date Design Started	92 SEP 01																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 SEP 15																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 MAR 20																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	YES																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	NAVAJO																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	30																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	30																							
(c) Total	60																							
(d) Contract	30																							
(e) In-house	30																							

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)								2. DATE	
AIR FORCE											
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION						4. COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX		
LITTLE ROCK AIR FORCE BASE, ARKANSAS						AIR MOBILITY COMMAND			0.79		
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			TOTAL
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	
a. As of 30 SEP 92		649	3669	481	474	535	12	174	721	9	6,724
b. End FY 1998		595	3360	453	474	535	12	174	721	9	6,333
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (7,210)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92) 181,231											
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory: 9,160											
d. Authorization Requested In This Program: 4,500											
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995) 2,250											
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years: 22,120											
g. Remaining Deficiency: 0											
h. Grand Total: 219,261											
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE		SCOPE		COST (\$000)		DESIGN STATUS			
CODE								START		CML	
141-459		ALTER JRTC OPERATIONS CENTER		23,190 SF		1,050		JUL 92		JUL 93	
211-157		ADD TO AND ALTER ENGINE INSPECTION AND REPAIR SHOP		9,200 SF		1,200		APR 92		MAY 93	
740-884		ADD TO AND ALTER CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER (DBOF)		25,800 SF		2,250		JUL 92		JUL 93	
						TOTAL:				4,500	
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995)											
130-835		ADD TO AND ALTER SECURITY POLICE OPERATIONS		18,122 SF		2,250					
						TOTAL:				2,250	
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
149-962		CONTROL TOWER		1 EA		2,100					
411-135		REPAIR JET FUEL STORAGE		LS		6,000					
740-443		TRANSIENT LODGING FACILITY		18,500 SF		1,700					
740-674		ADD TO AND ALTER PHYSICAL FITNESS CENTER		52,500 SF		4,100					
841-427		ADD TO WATER STORAGE TANK		LS		6,000					
10. Mission or Major Functions: An airlift wing which includes four C-130 squadrons, one of which conducts C-130 training for all DoD components and foreign countries, and an Air National Guard tactical training group with C-130 aircraft.											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:										0	
b. Water pollution:										0	
c. Occupational safety and health:										0	
d. Other Environmental:										6,000	

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
AIR FORCE						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION			4. PROJECT TITLE			
LITTLE ROCK AIR FORCE BASE, ARKANSAS			ALTER JRTC OPERATIONS CENTER			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT		6. CATEGORY CODE	7. PROJECT NUMBER		8. PROJECT COST(\$000)	
4.18.97		141-459	NKAK943007		1,050	
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
ALTER JRTC OPERATIONS CENTER		SF	23,200	35	812	
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					75	
UTILITIES		LS			(75)	
SUBTOTAL					887	
CONTINGENCY (10%)					89	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					976	
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					59	
TOTAL REQUEST					1,035	
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					1,050	
10. Description of Proposed Construction: All electrical, mechanical and structural work necessary to alter facility for JRTC. Work includes altering interior walls and lighting. Relocate/install partitions, lockers and communications. Upgrade mechanical systems and replace built-up roof with pitched roof and necessary support. Area includes operations and crew area.						
11. REQUIREMENT: 23,200 SF ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 3,020 SF <u>PROJECT:</u> Alter Joint Readiness Training Center (JRTC) operations center. (New Mission) <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> Adequately sized facilities are required for the 34th Combat Airlift Training Squadron (CATS) crew readiness operations in support of JRTC operations at Little Rock AFB. This facility provides operational space/briefing room for the Joint Operations Training Staff (JOTS), and kitchen, dining, study rooms and sleeping quarters for the air crews and ground crews who are TDY to Little Rock in support of JRTC operations. The JRTC is AMC's premier forum for ensuring the combat readiness of aircrews, ALCE (Airlift Control Element), Combat Control and Air Base Ground Defense forces. <u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> The 34th CATS became operational at Little Rock in 1989. Part of their mission, to provide the C-130 instructor school, was bedded down in a vacant facility located on the flightline. The balance of their mission, JOTS, is temporarily bedded down in a Group Headquarters administrative facility. All the billeting requirements to house the air and ground crews who go to Little Rock TDY to support JRTC operations are met by utilizing off-base quarters. This is not only expensive (\$350,000 annually), but it does not provide realistic training and the timely response required to meet JRTC mobility deployment times. There are 100						

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	.FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION LITTLE ROCK AIR FORCE BASE, ARKANSAS		
4. PROJECT TITLE ALTER JRTC OPERATIONS CENTER	5. PROJECT NUMBER NKAK943007	
<p>personnel involved in each exercise which lasts fourteen days and there are ten rotations per year.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> The high billeting cost for TDY crews to stay off-base will reduce the number of personnel that units can afford to send to JRTC. Off base billeting does not provide realistic training by dislocating personnel from the training environment necessary to support JRTC.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements". Project has been considered for FY97 force structure end strength.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION LITTLE ROCK AIR FORCE BASE, ARKANSAS																								
4. PROJECT TITLE ALTER JRTC OPERATIONS CENTER	5. PROJECT NUMBER NKAK943007																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="376 625 1450 758"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 JUL 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 AUG 03</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 JUL 08</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="376 821 1450 884"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="376 947 1450 1104"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>63</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>37</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>100</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>100</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 JUL 15	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 AUG 03	(d) Date Design Complete	93 JUL 08	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	63	(b) All Other Design Costs	37	(c) Total	100	(d) Contract		(e) In-house	100
(a) Date Design Started	92 JUL 15																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 AUG 03																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 JUL 08																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	63																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	37																							
(c) Total	100																							
(d) Contract																								
(e) In-house	100																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION LITTLE ROCK AIR FORCE BASE, ARKANSAS		4. PROJECT TITLE ADD/ALTER ENGINE INSPECTION AND REPAIR SHOP (DBOF)			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 4.18.96	6. CATEGORY CODE 211-157	7. PROJECT NUMBER NKAK903001	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 1,200		
9. COST ESTIMATES					
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
ADD/ALTER ENGINE INSPECTION AND REPAIR SHOP (DBOF)		SF	9,600		883
ADDITION		SF	8,000	94	(752)
ALTERATION		SF	1,600	82	(131)
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					150
UTILITIES		LS			(75)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(50)
PAVEMENTS		SY	700	36	(25)
SUBTOTAL					1,033
CONTINGENCY (10%)					103
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					1,136
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (5.5%)					62
TOTAL REQUEST					1,198
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					1,200
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Reinforced concrete foundations and floor, structural steel frames, masonry walls, roof and monorails with hoists. Area includes shop space, maintenance management space, utilities and other necessary support.					
11. REQUIREMENT: 41,564 SF ADEQUATE: 31,964 SF SUBSTANDARD: 1,600 SF PROJECT: Add to and alter aircraft engine inspection and repair shop. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: An expanded facility is required to maintain, inspect and repair aircraft engines and provide storage for spare engines, tools and support equipment. This facility supports maintenance and inspection operations for 401 C-130 aircraft engines. CURRENT SITUATION: The engine repair and build-up crew areas are not large enough to support the number of engines required for effective productivity. Space is necessary for maintenance on four engines while existing facility supports only three engine maintenance spaces. The gas turbine compressor section is overcrowded with special tools, test equipment, as well as with repairable, serviceable and in-work units. The quick engine change (QEC) kit section has been divided into separate sections due to critical space problems, creating span of control problems. IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: Maintenance operations will continue to be performed in an overcrowded facility increasing the risk of accidents. ADDITIONAL: There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements". Project has been considered for FY97 force structure end strength.					

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																																													
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION LITTLE ROCK AIR FORCE BASE, ARKANSAS																																															
4. PROJECT TITLE ADD/ALTER ENGINE INSPECTION AND REPAIR SHOP (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER NKAK903001																																														
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td colspan="3">(1) Status:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td></td> <td>92 APR 21</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td></td> <td>40%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td></td> <td>92 AUG 28</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td></td> <td>93 MAY 25</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(2) Basis:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td></td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td></td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td></td> <td>72</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td></td> <td>42</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td></td> <td>114</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td></td> <td>114</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(4) Construction Start</td> <td></td> <td>94 MAR</td> </tr> </table> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(1) Status:			(a) Date Design Started		92 APR 21	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		40%	(c) Date 35% Designed		92 AUG 28	(d) Date Design Complete		93 MAY 25	(2) Basis:			(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A	(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)			(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		72	(b) All Other Design Costs		42	(c) Total		114	(d) Contract			(e) In-house		114	(4) Construction Start		94 MAR
(1) Status:																																															
(a) Date Design Started		92 APR 21																																													
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		40%																																													
(c) Date 35% Designed		92 AUG 28																																													
(d) Date Design Complete		93 MAY 25																																													
(2) Basis:																																															
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO																																													
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A																																													
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)																																															
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		72																																													
(b) All Other Design Costs		42																																													
(c) Total		114																																													
(d) Contract																																															
(e) In-house		114																																													
(4) Construction Start		94 MAR																																													

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION LITTLE ROCK AIR FORCE BASE, ARKANSAS		4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO AND ALTER CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER (DBOF)		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 4.18.96	6. CATEGORY CODE 740-884	7. PROJECT NUMBER NKAK923003	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 2,250	

9. COST ESTIMATES				
ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
ADD TO AND ALTER CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER (DBOF)	SF	23,200		1,588
ADDITION	SF	8,300	89	(739)
ALTERATION	SF	14,900	57	(849)
SUPPORTING FACILITIES				355
UTILITIES	LS			(200)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS	LS			(50)
PAVEMENTS	LS			(105)
SUBTOTAL				1,943
CONTINGENCY (10%)				194
TOTAL CONTRACT COST				2,137
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)				128
TOTAL REQUEST				2,265
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)				2,250

10. Description of Proposed Construction: Concrete footings, foundations, and floor slab, masonry walls, brick veneer and hip roof. Includes space for reception area, administrative offices, classrooms, kitchen, mechanical room, fire protection, utilities and other necessary support. Air Conditioning: 60 Tons.

11. REQUIREMENT: 25,875 SF ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 14,900 SF
PROJECT: Add to and alter child development center. (Current Mission)
REQUIREMENT: A facility is required to provide adequate space and environment for child development requirements and an atmosphere conducive to the needs of 345 dependent children of military and civilian personnel assigned to the base.
CURRENT SITUATION: The existing facility provides only two thirds of the space needed to adequately support child care needs. Inefficiencies include lack of classroom space, administration, food service area and recreational support area. Changes in the makeup of the military and civilian population have increased the need for full-day child care development services. Single parents, dual working couples, and working spouses have changed the focus from a recreational support activity to a mission support program. Because more children stay at the center ten hours a day, five days a week, improved developmental care facilities must provide more adequate indoor and outdoor play space, learning centers, sleeping facilities and kitchen/food service areas. Off-base child care centers are available; however, they are substandard in that they are not certified by the State of Arkansas and do not meet minimum Air Force and Department of Defense standards for child care. These facilities provide little more than custodial care. They experience an extremely high turn-over rate in workers because they pay minimum wages. Workers are not

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION LITTLE ROCK AIR FORCE BASE, ARKANSAS		
4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO AND ALTER CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER NKAK923003	
<p>screened for health problems and criminal records. Most facilities do not provide care for children under two years old. The Little Rock Child Development Center is the only facility in the State of Arkansas accredited by the National Association for the Education of Young Children. Some home care is available on base but not nearly enough to meet base child care demands. The waiting list for full-time day care is for 83 children; however, many families do not bother to sign-up because the list is too long.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Lack of quality child care contributes to employee absenteeism, low morale and has a negative impact in the military and civilian workforces. Expanded program requirements and increased demand for child care cannot be provided due to lack of space.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> This project meets the criteria/scope specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". A life-cycle economic analysis has been performed comparing all reasonable options for accomplishing this project (status quo, addition/alteration and new construction). This analysis indicates the addition/alteration alternative is the most cost effective. Project has been considered for FY97 force structure end strength.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	.FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION LITTLE ROCK AIR FORCE BASE, ARKANSAS																								
4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO AND ALTER CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER NKAK923003																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="376 625 1450 760"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 JUL 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 JUL 27</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 JUL 14</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="376 823 1450 886"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="376 949 1450 1108"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>135</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>90</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>225</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>183</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>42</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 JUL 01	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	50%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 JUL 27	(d) Date Design Complete	93 JUL 14	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	135	(b) All Other Design Costs	90	(c) Total	225	(d) Contract	183	(e) In-house	42
(a) Date Design Started	92 JUL 01																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	50%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 JUL 27																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 JUL 14																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	135																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	90																							
(c) Total	225																							
(d) Contract	183																							
(e) In-house	42																							

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM AIR FORCE (computer generated)								2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION				4. COMMAND				5. AREA CONST COST INDEX			
EDWARDS AIR FORCE BASE, CALIFORNIA				AIR FORCE MATERIEL COMMAND				1.38			
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			TOTAL
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	
a. As of 30 SEP 92		658	3610	3376							7,644
b. End FY 1998		701	3300	2811							6,812
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (302,088)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)		599,802									
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:		67,300									
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:		11,300									
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)		15,300									
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:		28,900									
g. Remaining Deficiency:		0									
h. Grand Total:		722,602									
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE		SCOPE		COST (\$000)		DESIGN STATUS			
CODE								START		CMPL	
411-135		UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS PHASE II		38 EA		5,400		JUL 92		SEP 93	
740-884		CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER		35,000 SF		5,900		JUL 92		NOV 93	
		TOTAL:				11,300					
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995)											
121-122		UPGRADE HYDRANT FUELING SYSTEM		5,200 LF		2,600					
211-152		RENOVATE AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE FACILITY		234,500 SF		8,000					
311-115		F-22 ALTER ENGINEERING TEST FACILITY, PHASE I		43,900 SF		4,700					
		TOTAL:				15,300					
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
171-618		FIELD TRAINING FACILITY		10,000 SF		1,700					
211-152		COMPOSITE AIRCRAFT REPAIR FACILITY		25,000 SF		5,600					
411-000		REPAIR LIQUID FUEL STORAGE		LS		6,000					
422-264		EARTH COVERED STORAGE IGLOO		2,000 SF		1,200					
740-253		FAMILY SERVICE CENTER		12,000 SF		2,000					
10. Mission or Major Functions: Air Force Flight Test Center which is responsible for flight test activities for all USAF aircraft & related avionics, flight control, & weapons systems (primary test aircraft include B-1, B-2, B-52, C-23, F-15, F-16, F-117, MC-130, OA-37, T-38 & UH-1); Air Force Test Pilot School; & Astronautics Directorate of the Phillips Lab. Major tenants include US Army Aviation Engineering Activity; NSAS Ames Dryden Flight Research Facility; and Jet Propulsion Laboratory test facility. Also, a landing site for the space shuttle.											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:		0									
b. Water pollution:		0									
c. Occupational safety and health:		0									
d. Other Environmental:		0									

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
AIR FORCE						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION			4. PROJECT TITLE			
EDWARDS AIR FORCE BASE, CALIFORNIA			UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS PHASE II			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT		6. CATEGORY CODE	7. PROJECT NUMBER		8. PROJECT COST(\$000)	
7.80.56		411-135	FSPM947302		5,400	
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS, PHASE II		LS			2,919	
CONSTRUCT ABOVE GROUND TANKS		EA	30	40,330	(1,210)	
GAS CONNECTIONS AND BOILER CONVERSIONS		LS			(1,537)	
FUEL DISPENSING SYSTEM		EA	3	57,330	(172)	
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					1,705	
TANK REMOVAL		EA	85	4,824	(410)	
SITE ASSESSMENT AND REMEDIATION		LS			(865)	
UTILITIES		LS			(420)	
SUBTOTAL					4,624	
CONTINGENCY (10%)					462	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					5,086	
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					305	
TOTAL REQUEST					5,391	
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					5,400	
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Remove 85 underground storage tanks (USTs) and replace them with approximately 30 above ground tanks (ASTs) where required or provide natural gas laterals and convert boilers to gas where economical. Install overfill and cathodic protection, and vapor recovery systems for ASTs. Install fuel dispensing systems at three locations.						
11. REQUIREMENT: As required. PROJECT: Remove 85 underground storage tanks and replace with 30 above ground tanks, phase 2 of 4. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: This is a Level II environmental compliance project. Environmentally safe storage tanks are required to store petroleum products and other environmentally controlled substances, which are used in operating base gas stations, base shops, and laboratories. Underground tanks must comply with state or federal environmental regulations, whichever is more stringent. The California UST upgrade requirements under Title 23, Chapter 16, are similar to the Federal requirement contained under Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Subtitle I, 40 CFR Part 280 and 281. The rules require that all existing tanks be upgraded with leak detection, spill/overfill prevention, and cathodic protection (for steel tanks) by December 22, 1998. CURRENT SITUATION: The existing 85 USTs, associated piping and dispensing systems do not meet applicable EPA requirements. The USTs at Edwards Air Force Base were installed in high alkali content soil, which promotes corrosion of the bare steel. There are 85 USTs, varying in capacity of up to 25,000 gallons, located throughout the base that will be replaced under this project. Until corrections are implemented, leasing of temporary tanks in some areas is required. This is the second phase of a four						

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	.FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION EDWARDS AIR FORCE BASE, CALIFORNIA		
4. PROJECT TITLE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS PHASE II	5. PROJECT NUMBER FSPM947302	
<p>phased effort to upgrade tanks on this base.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Edwards Air Force Base will continue to pose a threat of contaminating the environment with hazardous petroleum products. Additionally, the base can be served with Notices of Violation and the Air Force may be subjected to lawsuits and fines. Support of current and future test programs, such as the C-17, and the F-22 will be hampered by a lack of fuel storage facilities.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> All known alternative options were considered during the development of this project. No other option could reasonably meet mission requirements. A certificate of exemption is being prepared. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements".</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	.FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION EDWARDS AIR FORCE BASE, CALIFORNIA																								
4. PROJECT TITLE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS PHASE II	5. PROJECT NUMBER FSPM947302																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 JUL 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 NOV 30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 SEP 14</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>310</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>150</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>460</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>460</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 JUL 01	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 NOV 30	(d) Date Design Complete	93 SEP 14	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	310	(b) All Other Design Costs	150	(c) Total	460	(d) Contract		(e) In-house	460
(a) Date Design Started	92 JUL 01																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 NOV 30																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 SEP 14																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	310																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	150																							
(c) Total	460																							
(d) Contract																								
(e) In-house	460																							

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
AIR FORCE						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION				4. PROJECT TITLE		
EDWARDS AIR FORCE BASE, CALIFORNIA				CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT		6. CATEGORY CODE	7. PROJECT NUMBER	8. PROJECT COST(\$000)		
7.28.06		740-884	FSPM923018	5,900		
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER		SF	35,000	125	4,375	
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					905	
UTILITIES		LS			(320)	
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(205)	
PAVEMENTS		LS			(185)	
DEMOLITION		SF	21,500	9	(195)	
SUBTOTAL					5,280	
CONTINGENCY (5%)					264	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					5,544	
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					333	
TOTAL REQUEST					5,877	
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					5,900	
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Reinforced concrete foundation and floor slab, masonry walls and roof system. Include playground, pavements, utility extensions, landscaping, necessary support, and demolition of four buildings. Air Conditioning: 60 Tons.						
11. REQUIREMENT: 47,125 SF ADEQUATE: 12,150 SF SUBSTANDARD: 21,500 SF PROJECT: Construct a child development center. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: Adequate space to provide the necessary child care and preschool services for up to 500 dependents of military and DOD civilian personnel. This facility must provide separate primary care rooms for infants, toddlers, preschool and school age children up to age 12, an isolation area, kitchen, preschool class space, activity rooms, offices, staff training rooms, kitchen, storage and reception area. CURRENT SITUATION: One adequate facility, 12,150 SF, supports approximately 225 children, well over its design capacity of 150 children. Two other facilities are currently being used for other child care and preschool programs. A substandard building is being used as a preschool (3-5 years old) for classes of over 300 children. Built in 1951 and later relocated to its present location, this facility is in poor shape, is not properly configured, and has far exceeded its useful life. Also, space in an elementary school building is being used temporarily to house after-school programs for approximately 65 children between the ages of five and twelve. Due to the remote location of Edwards Air Force Base, the nearest child care services are located approximately 38 miles from the base. Personnel who live and work at Edwards must drive approximately three hours a day (two round trips) exclusively for child care. Additionally, the cost of these services in local communities is 30-75%						

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION EDWARDS AIR FORCE BASE, CALIFORNIA		
4. PROJECT TITLE CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	5. PROJECT NUMBER FSPM923018	
<p>higher than the average cost of base services, further impacting the military family. Most of the off-base centers provide neither drop-in service nor care for children under 3 years of age. Due to the high usage rate of on-base facilities, drop-in care is often unavailable. The waiting list as of December 1991 is 100 children. Completion of this project will allow demolition of four substandard buildings totalling 21,500 SF.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Adequate child care services will not be available for dependents of Edwards AFB employees. Personnel will be forced to seek other more expensive child care services at locations more than 38 miles off-base.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> This project meets the criteria/scope specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of new construction, revitalization, and status quo operation. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, new construction was found to be the most cost efficient over the life of the project.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	.FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION EDWARDS AIR FORCE BASE, CALIFORNIA																								
4. PROJECT TITLE CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	5. PROJECT NUMBER FSPM923018																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 JUL 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 OCT 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 NOV 20</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>300</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>150</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>450</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>450</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 FEB</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 JUL 01	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 OCT 15	(d) Date Design Complete	93 NOV 20	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	300	(b) All Other Design Costs	150	(c) Total	450	(d) Contract		(e) In-house	450
(a) Date Design Started	92 JUL 01																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 OCT 15																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 NOV 20																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	300																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	150																							
(c) Total	450																							
(d) Contract																								
(e) In-house	450																							

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)							2. DATE		
AIR FORCE											
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION				4. COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX				
MCCLELLAN AIR FORCE BASE, CALIFORNIA				AIR FORCE MATERIEL COMMAND			1.14				
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	TOTAL
a. As of 30 SEP 92		442	2533	10039							13,014
b. End FY 1998		417	2411	8455							11,283
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage:		(3,752)									
b. Inventory Total As Of:		(30 SEP 92) 474,559									
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:		37,430									
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:		1,900									
e. Authorization Included In Following Program:		(FY 1995) 11,350									
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:		95,100									
g. Remaining Deficiency:		0									
h. Grand Total:		620,339									
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE		SCOPE		COST (\$000)		DESIGN STATUS			
<u>CODE</u>								<u>START</u>		<u>CMPL</u>	
880-232		FIRE PROTECTION AIRCRAFT FACILITIES (DBOF)		196,000 SF		1,900		AUG 92		NOV 93	
				TOTAL:		1,900					
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995)											
113-321		UPGRADE AIRCRAFT PARKING APRON		95,000 SY		6,500					
179-511		FIRE TRAINING FACILITY		1 EA		950					
871-183		UPGRADE STORM DRAINAGE SYSTEM		3,600 LF		3,900					
				TOTAL:		11,350					
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
141-764		INTEGRATION SUPPORT FACILITY		65,000 SF		10,600					
141-764		ATF-SOFTWARE ENGINEERING ENVIRONMENT		100,000 SF		40,000					
149-962		CONTROL TOWER		1 EA		2,550					
211-116		IMPROVE DEPOT MAINTENANCE HANGAR		LS		9,300					
441-758		WAREHOUSE FACILITY		117,600 SF		12,200					
10. Mission or Major Functions: Sacramento Air Logistics Center which is responsible for logistics management, support, and depot-level maintenance of A-10, F/EF-111, and F-117 aircraft; Air Force Reserve's Headquarters Fourth Air Force and air refueling wing (KC-135 aircraft); Air Rescue Service; Air Mobility Command weather reconnaissance squadron (WC-135 aircraft) and airlift detachment (C-21 aircraft); and an Air Combat Command test and evaluation squadron (F-111 aircraft).											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:		9,500									
b. Water pollution:		3,620									
c. Occupational safety and health:		0									
d. Other Environmental:		2,000									

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)				2. DATE		
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION MCCLELLAN AIR FORCE BASE, CALIFORNIA				4. PROJECT TITLE FIRE PROTECTION AIRCRAFT FACILITIES (DBOF)				
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 7.28.96		6. CATEGORY CODE 880-232	7. PROJECT NUMBER PRJY881011		8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 1,900			
9. COST ESTIMATES								
ITEM					U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
FIRE PROTECTION AIRCRAFT FACILITIES (DBOF)					SF	196,000	7	1,372
SUPPORTING FACILITIES								240
UTILITIES					LS			(200)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS					LS			(40)
SUBTOTAL								1,612
CONTINGENCY (10%)								161
TOTAL CONTRACT COST								1,773
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)								106
TOTAL REQUEST								1,879
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)								1,900
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Install aqueous film forming foam (AFFF) preaction sprinkler systems and wet pipe sprinkler systems in fifteen buildings, including piping, sprinkler heads, nozzles, and necessary support.								
11. REQUIREMENT: As required. <u>PROJECT:</u> Install fire protection systems in fifteen buildings. (Current Mission) <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> Automatic AFFF preaction systems are required to support critical base facilities and their contents, including multi-million dollar aircraft and equipment. These systems are needed to minimize hazard to life and property by quickly suppressing a fuel fire before injury or widespread damage can occur. This level of fire protection is consistent with standards developed by the National Fire Protection Association. <u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> There are no fire protection systems in fifteen docks used to accomplish depot maintenance of first line aircraft. A fire in any of these facilities could endanger the building, its contents and occupants. All of these buildings are needed to accomplish depot maintenance workloads assigned to the Sacramento Air Logistics Center. <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Loss of life, first line aircraft and equipment will remain a possibility. The total value of aircraft at risk could be as high as \$650 million. <u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements".								

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	.FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION MCCLELLAN AIR FORCE BASE, CALIFORNIA																								
4. PROJECT TITLE FIRE PROTECTION AIRCRAFT FACILITIES (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER PRJY881011																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="371 625 1450 762"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 AUG 19</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 OCT 24</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 NOV 22</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="371 821 1450 888"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="371 947 1450 1115"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>100</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>122</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>222</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>139</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>83</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 JAN</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 AUG 19	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 OCT 24	(d) Date Design Complete	93 NOV 22	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	100	(b) All Other Design Costs	122	(c) Total	222	(d) Contract	139	(e) In-house	83
(a) Date Design Started	92 AUG 19																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 OCT 24																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 NOV 22																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	100																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	122																							
(c) Total	222																							
(d) Contract	139																							
(e) In-house	83																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)							2. DATE		
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION TRAVIS AIR FORCE BASE, CALIFORNIA					4. COMMAND AIR MOBILITY COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX 1.37			
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			TOTAL
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	
a. As of 30 SEP 92		1113	5997	2040	177	411		5	16		9,759
b. End FY 1998		1032	5549	1996	177	411		5	16		9,186
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (6,927)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)		439,576									
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:		56,830									
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:		14,040									
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)		9,450									
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:		31,560									
g. Remaining Deficiency:		0									
h. Grand Total:		551,456									
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE		SCOPE		COST (\$000)		DESIGN STATUS			
CODE								START		CML	
211-152		AIRCRAFT GENERAL PURPOSE MAINTENANCE SHOP		66,900 SF		11,200		FEB 93		DEC 93	
411-135		UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS		LS		2,840		JUN 92		DEC 93	
				TOTAL:		14,040					
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995)											
179-511		FIRE TRAINING FACILITY		LS		950					
813-231		UPGRADE ELECTRICAL DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM		30,000 KV		8,500					
				TOTAL:		9,450					
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
171-618		FIELD TRAINING FACILITY		36,600 SF		5,900					
179-511		FIREMEN TRAINING FACILITY		LS		950					
411-135		REPAIR JET FUEL STORAGE		LS		4,300					
724-417		VISITING OFFICERS QUARTERS		100 PN		7,000					
826-123		OVER 100 TONS A/C PLANT		220 PN		1,500					
10. Mission or Major Functions: Headquarters Twenty-Second Air Force; an airlift wing which includes two C-5 and two C-141 squadrons; an Air Force Reserve associate airlift wing (C-5 and C-141 aircraft); a major Air Force medical center; and the largest aerial port on the west coast.											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:		0									
b. Water pollution:		0									
c. Occupational safety and health:		0									
d. Other Environmental:		4,300									

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)				2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION TRAVIS AIR FORCE BASE, CALIFORNIA				4. PROJECT TITLE AIRCRAFT GENERAL PURPOSE MAINTENANCE SHOP			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 4.18.96		6. CATEGORY CODE 211-152		7. PROJECT NUMBER XDAT923002		8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 11,200	
9. COST ESTIMATES							
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)		
AIRCRAFT GENERAL PURPOSE MAINTENANCE SHOP		SF	66,900		8,567		
GENERAL PURPOSE MAINTENANCE SHOPS		SF	62,000	120	(7,440)		
NON-DESTRUCTIVE INSPECTION SHOP		SF	4,900	230	(1,127)		
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					1,450		
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(100)		
UTILITIES		LS			(600)		
PAVEMENTS		LS			(350)		
DEMOLITION/ASBESTOS REMOVAL		SF	67,000	6	(400)		
SUBTOTAL					10,017		
CONTINGENCY (5%)					501		
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					10,518		
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					631		
TOTAL REQUEST					11,149		
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					11,200		
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Metal, concrete facility with sloped roof. Area includes space for maintenance management non-destructive inspection, aircraft maintenance, training, and storage. Includes utilities, fire protection, pre-wired workstations asbestos removal, demolition and other necessary support. Air Conditioning: 20 Tons.							
11. REQUIREMENT: 131,633 SF ADEQUATE: 21,158 SF SUBSTANDARD: 122,566 SF <u>PROJECT:</u> Construct aircraft general purpose maintenance shop. (Current Mission) <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> Adequate aircraft maintenance space for fabrication and structural repair, cleaning and degreasing operations, hydraulics repair, battery shop, wheel and tire shop, maintenance management and storage of aircraft parts to support assigned C-5 and C-141 aircraft. Space is also required to support field level non-destructive inspection (NDI) of aircraft components. <u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> The existing aircraft general purpose shop is a 38-year-old wooden facility which has deteriorated beyond economical repair. Wooden support columns have cracked and twisted 30 degrees. They have been reinforced by installing metal plates. The support beams are also cracked and have weakened to the point that additional steel beams have been installed to provide temporary support. Ventilation of some shop space is non-existent. The work area, while adequate in gross size, does not provide adequate work space because it cannot be configured properly to support desired equipment layout. Extra steel support beams that were installed to support the roof prohibit safe layout of equipment. Minimal space between equipment cannot be provided. Some equipment throws off hot							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	. FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION TRAVIS AIR FORCE BASE, CALIFORNIA		
4. PROJECT TITLE AIRCRAFT GENERAL PURPOSE MAINTENANCE SHOP	5. PROJECT NUMBER XDAT923002	
<p>steel shavings and workers using adjacent equipment must interrupt their work to maintain safe working distances between operating machines. Wing safety has identified this safety deficiency with a risk assessment code (RAC) 3. No other facilities exist on base that could be used to support this function. The existing 67,000 SF facility will be demolished upon completion of this project.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Aircraft maintenance and parts repair will continue to be performed in a substandard, poorly configured facility which reduces productivity. Due to unsafe conditions, there is an increased possibility that loss of life or serious injury could occur.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements". A life-cycle economic analysis has been performed comparing all reasonable options for accomplishing this project (status quo, renovation and new construction). This analysis indicates the new construction is the most economical. Project has been considered for FY97 force structure end strength.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION TRAVIS AIR FORCE BASE, CALIFORNIA																								
4. PROJECT TITLE AIRCRAFT GENERAL PURPOSE MAINTENANCE SHOP	5. PROJECT NUMBER XDAT923002																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="371 632 1425 762"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 AUG 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 DEC 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 DEC 29</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="371 825 1343 888"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="371 951 1425 1115"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>560</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>340</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>900</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>810</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>90</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 APR</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 AUG 01	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 DEC 15	(d) Date Design Complete	93 DEC 29	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	560	(b) All Other Design Costs	340	(c) Total	900	(d) Contract	810	(e) In-house	90
(a) Date Design Started	92 AUG 01																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 DEC 15																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 DEC 29																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	560																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	340																							
(c) Total	900																							
(d) Contract	810																							
(e) In-house	90																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION TRAVIS AIR FORCE BASE, CALIFORNIA			4. PROJECT TITLE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS (DBOF)			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 4.18.56	6. CATEGORY CODE 411-135	7. PROJECT NUMBER XDAT943075	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 2,840			
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS (DBOF)		LS			2,400	
UPGRADE UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANKS		EA	7	40,000	(280)	
CONSTRUCT UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANKS		EA	10	107,000	(1,070)	
CONSTRUCT ABOVEGROUND STORAGE TANKS		EA	14	75,000	(1,050)	
SUBTOTAL					2,400	
CONTINGENCY (10%)					240	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					2,640	
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					158	
TOTAL REQUEST					2,798	
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					2,840	
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Upgrade 7 tanks and their pressurized lines with leak detection. Replace 10 existing tanks with new double-walled underground tanks, leak detectors and other necessary support. In addition, replace another 14 underground tanks with aboveground tanks.						
11. REQUIREMENT: As required. <u>PROJECT:</u> Upgrade underground fuel storage tanks. (Current Mission) <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> This is a Level I environmental compliance project to upgrade underground storage tanks (USTs) regulated by the California State Water Resources Control Board (CSWRCB). This board has set standards that require all regulated USTs to have leak detection, corrosion protection, and spill/overflow prevention systems. If USTs are to be replaced, Air Force policy is to replace them with aboveground tanks or to relocate them into underground vaults wherever possible. <u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> The majority of the USTs at Travis have exceeded their design lives and are in need of replacement. Approximately 97% of the regulated USTs are also out of compliance with current (1988) state regulations. All of the regulated USTs require annual integrity (tightness) testing, daily fluid level monitoring and monthly inventory reconciliation and control, since they lack the proper continuous monitoring appliances and controls. If these tasks are not performed, the exposure to environmental liability will increase. These liabilities can be eliminated through the installation of the new USTs or aboveground storage tanks (ASTs) and associated continuous monitoring/alarm systems. <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Failure to bring the USTs into environmental compliance will result in Travis AFB receiving a Notice of Violation (NOV) from the regulators. This will ultimately result in fines or litigation						

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	.FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION TRAVIS AIR FORCE BASE, CALIFORNIA		
4. PROJECT TITLE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER XDAT943075	
<p>and unfavorable publicity for the Air Force. All tanks must meet regulations or be permanently closed. The absence of sufficient fuel storage due to mandatory tank closure would seriously jeopardize the base's mission.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements". A preliminary analysis of reasonable options for accomplishing this project (status quo, renovation, and new construction) was done. It indicates there is only one option that satisfies regulatory requirements. Because of this, a full economic analysis was not performed. A certificate of exception has been prepared. Project has been considered for FY97 force structure end strength.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	.FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION TRAVIS AIR FORCE BASE, CALIFORNIA																								
4. PROJECT TITLE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER XDAT943075																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="379 619 1462 766"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 JUN 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>93 JAN 31</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>94 JAN 05</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="379 819 1462 892"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="379 945 1462 1113"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>65</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>65</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>65</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 MAY</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 JUN 01	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	93 JAN 31	(d) Date Design Complete	94 JAN 05	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	65	(b) All Other Design Costs		(c) Total	65	(d) Contract	65	(e) In-house	
(a) Date Design Started	92 JUN 01																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	93 JAN 31																							
(d) Date Design Complete	94 JAN 05																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	65																							
(b) All Other Design Costs																								
(c) Total	65																							
(d) Contract	65																							
(e) In-house																								

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)					2. DATE			
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION VANDENBERG AIR FORCE BASE, CALIFORNIA				4. COMMAND AIR FORCE SPACE COMMAND		5. AREA CONST COST INDEX 1.36				
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED		TOTAL
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	
a. As of 30 SEP 92		667	2650	1226						4,543
b. End FY 1998		638	2405	1217						4,260
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)										
a. Total Acreage: (98,831)										
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)		1,058,848								
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:		67,750								
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:		20,728								
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)		11,710								
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:		17,700								
g. Remaining Deficiency:		0								
h. Grand Total:		1,176,736								
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994										
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE			SCOPE		COST (\$000)		DESIGN STATUS	
CODE									START Cmpl	
141-391		SLFI - TPQ-18 RADAR FACILITY			6,100 SF		2,408		SEP 92 SEP 93	
319-995		HARDWARE STORAGE FACILITY			17,000 SF		3,500		NOV 92 JAN 94	
411-135		UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS			36 EA		1,700		TURN KEY	
812-223		SLFI - UPGRADE ELECTRICAL SYSTEM			LS		11,520		SEP 91 SEP 93	
880-234		SLFI - UPGRADE FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM			LS		1,600		SEP 92 SEP 93	
TOTAL:							20,728			
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995)										
141-766		SLFI - CHEMICAL TEST AND ANALYSIS LABORATORY			14,600 SF		4,200			
179-511		FIRE TRAINING FACILITY			LS		1,550			
824-464		SLFI - UPGRADE NATURAL GAS SYSTEM			LS		5,960			
TOTAL:							11,710			
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:										
131-000		COMMUNICATIONS MANAGEMENT FACILITY			10,000 SF		1,300			
179-475		COMBAT ARMS SECURITY TRAINING RANGE			3,200 SF		1,300			
312-476		DMSP SATELLITE PROCESSING FACILITY			8,600 SF		3,200		TURN KEY	
724-417		VISITING OFFICERS QTRS, PH 1			120 PN		4,900			
831-155		INDUSTRIAL WASTEWATER TREATMNT			LS		7,000			
10. Mission or Major Functions: Headquarters Twentieth Air Force; a space wing which is responsible for operational and test launches of missiles, satellites, and space vehicles in polar orbits and for research and development of missile and space systems; a test wing responsible for ICBM operations test and evaluation launches; a missile evaluation squadron; a combat air rescue detachment (UH-1 helicopters); and an Air Training Command missile crew training squadron.										

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)						2. DATE			
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION VANDENBERG AIR FORCE BASE, CALIFORNIA				4. COMMAND AIR FORCE SPACE COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX 1.36				
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			TOTAL
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	
a. As of											
b. End FY											
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: b. Inventory Total As Of: c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory: d. Authorization Requested In This Program: e. Authorization Included In Following Program: f. Planned In Next Four Program Years: g. Remaining Deficiency: h. Grand Total:											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:										1,550	
b. Water pollution:										4,700	
c. Occupational safety and health:										0	
d. Other Environmental:										0	

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE			
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION VANDENBERG AIR FORCE BASE, CALIFORNIA				4. PROJECT TITLE SLFI - TPQ-18 RADAR FACILITY				
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 3.51.81		6. CATEGORY CODE 141-391	7. PROJECT NUMBER XUMU885002		8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 2,408			
9. COST ESTIMATES								
ITEM					U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
SLFI - TPQ-18 RADAR FACILITY					SF	5,400	210	1,134
SUPPORTING FACILITIES								1,015
RADAR PEDESTAL					LS			(315)
UTILITIES					LS			(285)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS					LS			(195)
PAVEMENTS					LS			(155)
DEMOLITION OF TEMPORARY FACILITIES					LS			(65)
SUBTOTAL								2,149
CONTINGENCY (5%)								107
TOTAL CONTRACT COST								2,256
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)								135
TOTAL REQUEST								2,391
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)								2,408
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Concrete block building, concrete floor slab and foundation, raised flooring, truss and column steel frame, metal deck/built-up roof system and fire protection system. Includes necessary utilities, site prep, and roads and parking. Air Conditioning: 115 Tons.								
11. REQUIREMENT: 5,971 SF ADEQUATE: 571 SF SUBSTANDARD: 0 PROJECT: Construct a permanent facility to house the TPQ-18 radar. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: This is a Space Launch Facilities Infrastructure (SLFI) requirement. A permanent, reliable facility is required to support installation of new equipment, radar mods, and for improving operations and maintenance of the AN/TPQ-18 radar to support launch operations. This facility is required to support critical missions such as Titan, Scout, Minuteman, Atlas, Pegasus, Shuttle Operations, SDI work, and Edwards AFB test programs. This radar provides: a clear picture of missile trajectory to range safety; data collection for evaluation of the missile and test equipment; a picture of the performance of re-entry vehicles (simulated warheads); and pictures and data from a satellite in orbit. This radar must be operational in order to launch a missile. CURRENT SITUATION: The radar system is presently housed in 11 separate portable shelters with the associated cables to connect the various data and power circuits. The existing facilities, at their current location for 32 years, were originally intended as mobile shelters; however, the requirements have evolved to the point that a permanent facility is needed. There are 10 air conditioners used to cool the shelters. Consolidating the air conditioners into one system would save \$15,000/yr and collocating the radar system into one building would yield energy								

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	.FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION VANDENBERG AIR FORCE BASE, CALIFORNIA		
4. PROJECT TITLE SLFI - TPQ-18 RADAR FACILITY	5. PROJECT NUMBER XUMU885002	
<p>savings of \$8,000/yr. The temporary shelters and old cabling have deteriorated due to exposure to the elements, thus jeopardizing the ability to support the mission. Most of these shelters leak during rains, exposing valuable equipment to water damage; and the poor condition of these shelters allows rodents to enter, additionally exposing equipment and cabling to damage. These existing facilities have exceeded their useful life and cannot be economically upgraded. Valuable data was lost during a launch when exposed electrical cabling failed (the existing facility did not provide adequate protection against the weather).</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Existing cabling and equipment will continue to be susceptible to both environmental and pest damage; and facilities will not offer the degree of protection, functional space, or utility support needed to accommodate state-of-the art equipment. Vandenberg AFB is the only base from which polar-orbiting satellites may be launched. With the passing of time, the reliability of this radar site will become even worse; and without the needed building and equipment upgrades, this radar site will be less able to support the various, strategically important missions.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". All known alternative options were considered during the development of this project. No other option could meet the mission requirements; therefore, no economic analysis was needed or performed.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																																													
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION VANDENBERG AIR FORCE BASE, CALIFORNIA																																															
4. PROJECT TITLE SLFI - TPQ-18 RADAR FACILITY	5. PROJECT NUMBER XUMU885002																																														
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <table data-bbox="322 588 1470 1176"> <tr> <td colspan="3">(1) Status:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td></td> <td>92 SEP 21</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td></td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td></td> <td>92 DEC 30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td></td> <td>93 SEP 20</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(2) Basis:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td></td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td></td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td></td> <td>140</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td></td> <td>70</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td></td> <td>210</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> <td>175</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td></td> <td>35</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(4) Construction Start</td> <td></td> <td>93 DEC</td> </tr> </table> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(1) Status:			(a) Date Design Started		92 SEP 21	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%	(c) Date 35% Designed		92 DEC 30	(d) Date Design Complete		93 SEP 20	(2) Basis:			(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A	(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)			(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		140	(b) All Other Design Costs		70	(c) Total		210	(d) Contract		175	(e) In-house		35	(4) Construction Start		93 DEC
(1) Status:																																															
(a) Date Design Started		92 SEP 21																																													
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%																																													
(c) Date 35% Designed		92 DEC 30																																													
(d) Date Design Complete		93 SEP 20																																													
(2) Basis:																																															
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO																																													
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A																																													
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)																																															
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		140																																													
(b) All Other Design Costs		70																																													
(c) Total		210																																													
(d) Contract		175																																													
(e) In-house		35																																													
(4) Construction Start		93 DEC																																													

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)		2. DATE	
AIR FORCE					
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION			4. PROJECT TITLE		
VANDENBERG AIR FORCE BASE, CALIFORNIA			HARDWARE STORAGE FACILITY		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT	6. CATEGORY CODE	7. PROJECT NUMBER	8. PROJECT COST(\$000)		
3.41.11	319-995	XUMU923002	3,500		
9. COST ESTIMATES					
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
HARDWARE STORAGE FACILITY		SF	17,000	110	1,870
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					1,255
UTILITIES		LS			(300)
PAVEMENTS		SY	6,000	38	(230)
SITE PREPARATION		LS			(150)
10 TON BRIDGE CRANES		EA	2	212,500	(425)
SECURITY SYSTEMS		LS			(150)
SUBTOTAL					3,125
CONTINGENCY (5%)					156
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					3,281
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					197
TOTAL REQUEST					3,478
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					3,500
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Masonry building with reinforced concrete foundations, concrete floor slabs, and roof system. Includes bridge cranes, fence, electronic security system, utilities and necessary support. Air Conditioning: 70 Tons.					
11. REQUIREMENT: 17,000 SF ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 0 PROJECT: Construct a hardware storage facility. (New Mission) REQUIREMENT: A secure storage facility is required for the Titan IV rocket program for handling space vehicle (SV) ground support equipment. This facility will provide secure, environmentally controlled space for storing SV support equipment in transit from the airfield or payload processing facilities to its launch complex. The reuseable transporters, containers, slings, and other items which normally accompany a SV must remain for contingency operations, in a secure, environmentally controlled facility, until mission completion. CURRENT SITUATION: There are no suitable facilities on Vandenberg AFB for the storage of all space vehicle associated items. Additionally, there is no space which could be converted to this function. IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: Space launch requirements would force storage of SV related items in unsecured areas. The Air Force continues to run the risk of compromising high-priority classified space flight systems. ADDITIONAL: There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide" or AFM 86-2. Space requirements were based on the size and quantity of the stored equipment. All known alternative options were considered during the development of this project. No other option could meet the mission requirements; therefore, no economic analysis was needed or performed. A					

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION VANDENBERG AIR FORCE BASE, CALIFORNIA		
4. PROJECT TITLE HARDWARE STORAGE FACILITY	5. PROJECT NUMBER XUMU923002	
certificate of exemption has been prepared.		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	: FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																																													
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION VANDENBERG AIR FORCE BASE, CALIFORNIA																																															
4. PROJECT TITLE HARDWARE STORAGE FACILITY	5. PROJECT NUMBER XUMU923002																																														
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td colspan="3">(1) Status:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td></td> <td>92 NOV 13</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td></td> <td>20%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td></td> <td>93 MAR 12</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td></td> <td>94 JAN 14</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(2) Basis:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td></td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td></td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td></td> <td>210</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td></td> <td>108</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td></td> <td>318</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td></td> <td>318</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(4) Construction Start</td> <td></td> <td>94 JUL</td> </tr> </table> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(1) Status:			(a) Date Design Started		92 NOV 13	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		20%	(c) Date 35% Designed		93 MAR 12	(d) Date Design Complete		94 JAN 14	(2) Basis:			(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A	(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)			(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		210	(b) All Other Design Costs		108	(c) Total		318	(d) Contract			(e) In-house		318	(4) Construction Start		94 JUL
(1) Status:																																															
(a) Date Design Started		92 NOV 13																																													
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		20%																																													
(c) Date 35% Designed		93 MAR 12																																													
(d) Date Design Complete		94 JAN 14																																													
(2) Basis:																																															
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO																																													
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A																																													
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)																																															
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		210																																													
(b) All Other Design Costs		108																																													
(c) Total		318																																													
(d) Contract																																															
(e) In-house		318																																													
(4) Construction Start		94 JUL																																													

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION VANDENBERG AIR FORCE BASE, CALIFORNIA		4. PROJECT TITLE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 3.58.56	6. CATEGORY CODE 411-135	7. PROJECT NUMBER XUMU924005	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 1,700		
9. COST ESTIMATES					
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS		LS			336
REPLACE FUEL STORAGE TANKS		EA	8	42,000	(336)
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					1,110
EXCAVATE CONTAMINATED SOIL & TEST		LS			(500)
LEAK DETECTION		EA	8	6,250	(50)
REMOVE 12 STORAGE TANKS		EA	12	30,000	(360)
CONCRETE WORK, DISPENSERS, & PIPING		LS			(200)
SUBTOTAL					1,446
CONTINGENCY (10%)					145
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					1,591
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					95
TOTAL REQUEST					1,686
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					1,700
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Includes excavation and removal of 11 underground and 1 aboveground fuel tanks and piping and dispensing systems. Replace with eight double-walled storage tanks, including associated piping, leak detection, new dispensers, and islands. Dispose of old tanks and residual fuels. Test for further contamination and remove soil as required.					
11. REQUIREMENT: As required. PROJECT: Replace underground storage tanks (USTs). (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: This is a Level I environmental compliance requirement. Tanks must be in compliance with DoD, federal, and state environmental regulations. These include the AF UST Management Strategy, Federal Regulation 40 CFR 280, and State of California, and Santa Barbara County regulations. The State of California required tanks to have leak detection systems by 1 Jan 1989. If USTs are to be replaced, Air Force policy is to replace them with aboveground tanks or to relocate them into underground vaults wherever possible. CURRENT SITUATION: The USTs are between 9 and 35 years old and will be out of compliance with the County of Santa Barbara in FY 94 if not removed or upgraded in accordance with the interagency agreement between the base and the county. Tanks are single-wall, some with a history of leaks. Gasoline pump dispensers are severely deteriorated due to weathering. Soil surrounding the tanks has been badly contaminated by either leaks and/or spills due to filling operations. Soil must be removed and disposed of in an environmentally responsible manner. This UST issue is being closely monitored by Santa Barbara County Environmental Health Services and the Regional Water Quality Control Board. IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: Without replacement and/or removal, USTs at					

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION VANDENBERG AIR FORCE BASE, CALIFORNIA		
4. PROJECT TITLE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	5. PROJECT NUMBER XUMU924005	
<p>Vandenberg AFB will be out of compliance and subject to legal ramifications. Not only will the tanks be out of compliance, but the soil in the vicinity of these USTs would remain contaminated, and this is also a violation of regulatory standards. In addition, allowing hazardous products to remain in the soil violates California State Water Quality Control Board regulations. Ground water could become extensively contaminated with the passage of time. Ground water contamination cleanup can be an extremely expensive and lengthy process. These USTs could cause escalation of the existing environmental problem.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". All known alternative options were considered during the development of this project. No other option could meet the mission requirements; therefore, no economic analysis was needed or performed.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	.FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE				
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION VANDENBERG AIR FORCE BASE, CALIFORNIA						
4. PROJECT TITLE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	5. PROJECT NUMBER XUMU924005					
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Project to be accomplished by one step turn key procedures</p> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="379 693 1455 766"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Design Allowance 102</p> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO					
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A					

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE			
AIR FORCE								
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION				4. PROJECT TITLE				
VANDENBERG AIR FORCE BASE, CALIFORNIA				SLFI - UPGRADE ELECTRICAL SYSTEM				
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT		6. CATEGORY CODE	7. PROJECT NUMBER		8. PROJECT COST(\$000)			
3.51.81		812-223	XUMU954006		11,520			
9. COST ESTIMATES								
ITEM					U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
SLFI - UPGRADE ELECTRICAL SYSTEM					LS			9,873
ELECT SERVICE, RANGE OPS CTR					LS			(762)
ELECT SERV, LAUNCH FACILITIES					LS			(3,729)
ELECT SERV, VTS & RADAR					LS			(865)
ELECT SERV, CRITICAL FACS					LS			(2,454)
SUPERVISORY CONTROL & DATA ACQUISITION					LS			(2,063)
SUBTOTAL								9,873
CONTINGENCY (10%)								987
TOTAL CONTRACT COST								10,860
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)								652
TOTAL REQUEST								11,512
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)								11,520
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Upgrade the 12 KV electrical basewide system. Upgrade/relocate distribution lines, retrofill/upgrade transformers, replace breakers/insulators/switches, provide new switchgear and shelters, provide relaying systems, install voltage drop and power factor correction devices, and provide a computerized monitoring capability for the entire system.								
11. REQUIREMENT: As required. <u>PROJECT:</u> Upgrade electrical system. (Current Mission) <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> This is a Space Launch Facilities Infrastructure (SLFI) requirement. This base supports DoD and NASA missions vital to our defense. This is the only base from which a polar-orbiting satellite can be launched. The high-voltage electrical system must be capable of providing sufficient, reliable electrical capacity for these missions. The system must perform with minimum impact or damage to electronic equipment in spite of current surges, lines that go to ground, and lightning. A computerized monitoring system is required to monitor the entire system and provide rapid response to correct problems. <u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> The existing 12 KV electrical system has become unreliable for missile launches; thus it is bypassed during certain launch-critical operations. These operations must then be powered by local, on-site generators. Forecasted voltage drops must be precluded to avoid damage to valuable electronic equipment, motors, and other electrical devices. When a power outage occurs, personnel must physically seek out the problem, consuming valuable time; whereas, modern monitoring systems can identify the location of problems as they occur. The corrosive environment (fog and salt) at this location shortens life expectancies of electrical distribution system components; insulators								

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION VANDENBERG AIR FORCE BASE, CALIFORNIA		
4. PROJECT TITLE SLFI - UPGRADE ELECTRICAL SYSTEM	5. PROJECT NUMBER XUMU954006	
<p>deteriorate and are prone to flashovers. Power poles, circuit breakers, and transformers should be replaced. Relay systems need to be upgraded. Power lines need to be relocated to improve accessibility.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> The mission of this base cannot be properly executed without these needed upgrades. If no action is taken, this 12 KV electrical system will continue to deteriorate. Resulting voltage drops will begin to take their toll on launches and important mission-related equipment. During brown-outs, lights will flicker and dim, and electronic equipment and motors will be damaged.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". All known alternative options were considered during the development of this project. No other option could meet the mission requirements; therefore, no economic analysis was needed or performed.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	:FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION VANDENBERG AIR FORCE BASE, CALIFORNIA																								
4. PROJECT TITLE SLFI - UPGRADE ELECTRICAL SYSTEM	5. PROJECT NUMBER XUMU954006																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="388 630 1457 766"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>91 SEP 24</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 JUL 29</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 SEP 03</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="388 829 1457 892"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="388 955 1457 1113"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>708</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>357</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>1065</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>862</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>203</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	91 SEP 24	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 JUL 29	(d) Date Design Complete	93 SEP 03	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	708	(b) All Other Design Costs	357	(c) Total	1065	(d) Contract	862	(e) In-house	203
(a) Date Design Started	91 SEP 24																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 JUL 29																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 SEP 03																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	708																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	357																							
(c) Total	1065																							
(d) Contract	862																							
(e) In-house	203																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION VANDENBERG AIR FORCE BASE, CALIFORNIA		4. PROJECT TITLE SLFI - UPGRADE FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 3.51.81	6. CATEGORY CODE 880-234	7. PROJECT NUMBER XUMU910130	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 1,600	
9. COST ESTIMATES				
ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
SLFI-UPGRADE FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM	LS			1,128
SPRINKLER SYSTEM	SF	141,000	8	(1,128)
SUPPORTING FACILITIES				260
REPLACE WOODEN PARTITIONS	LS			(120)
ALARM SYSTEM	LS			(140)
SUBTOTAL				1,388
CONTINGENCY (10%)				139
TOTAL CONTRACT COST				1,527
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)				92
TOTAL REQUEST				1,619
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)				1,600
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Install integrated fire detection system with electronic control panels and state-of-the-art sensors. Install sprinkler system. Replace wooden partitions with fireproof materials to meet current Life Safety Codes.				
11. REQUIREMENT: As required. <u>PROJECT:</u> Install fire protection system in the Titan Test and Support Facility. (Current Mission) <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> This is a Space Launch Facilities Infrastructure (SLFI) requirement. Provide fire detection and suppression systems to the Titan Test & Support Facility as required by AFR 88-15. <u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> With no fire suppression or detection systems, this facility fails to meet USAF life safety code standards. The building contains costly data & test equipment and a launch support (fuel handling) trailer. In the event of a fire, personnel assigned to the facility must operate pull-stations, alarmed only to this building. Wooden partitions on the shop floor of the high-bay area would promote rapid spread of a fire, posing extreme threat to personnel, space vehicle components, and other critical assets. <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Without sprinkler protection or an adequate fire alarm system, personnel face high fire risk, and the facility and contents are subject to total loss, significantly impacting the launch program. Loss of functional capabilities to the Titan Test and Support Facility would result in the inability to support Titan launches and would necessitate delaying launches. Due to the critical timing and scheduling of the national information and security payloads, this would have a significant impact on national defense. <u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of				

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	.FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION VANDENBERG AIR FORCE BASE, CALIFORNIA		
4. PROJECT TITLE SLFI - UPGRADE FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM	5. PROJECT NUMBER XUMU910130	
<p>Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide".</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION VANDENBERG AIR FORCE BASE, CALIFORNIA																								
4. PROJECT TITLE SLFI - UPGRADE FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM	5. PROJECT NUMBER XUMU910130																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="376 638 1422 764"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 SEP 21</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 DEC 28</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 SEP 15</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="376 831 1339 894"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="376 957 1422 1115"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>95</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>145</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>120</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>25</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 SEP 21	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 DEC 28	(d) Date Design Complete	93 SEP 15	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	95	(b) All Other Design Costs	50	(c) Total	145	(d) Contract	120	(e) In-house	25
(a) Date Design Started	92 SEP 21																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 DEC 28																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 SEP 15																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	95																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	50																							
(c) Total	145																							
(d) Contract	120																							
(e) In-house	25																							

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)								2. DATE	
AIR FORCE											
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION CLASSIFIED LOCATIONS (INSIDE AND OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES)						4. COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX 0.00		
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			TOTAL
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	
a. As of 30 SEP 92											
b. End FY 1998											
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (0)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)											0
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:											0
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:											13,640
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)											44,200
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:											119,800
g. Remaining Deficiency:											0
h. Grand Total:											177,640
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY						COST		DESIGN STATUS			
<u>CODE</u>		<u>PROJECT TITLE</u>				<u>SCOPE</u>		<u>(\$000)</u>		<u>START</u> <u>CMPL</u>	
100-000		SPECIAL TACTICAL UNIT DETACHMENT FACILITY				LS		5,540			
100-000		OMEGA FACILITIES				LS		2,600			
442-758		WAR READINESS MATERIEL WAREHOUSE				120,000 SF		5,500		MAY 92 SEP 93	
							TOTAL:		13,640		
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995)											
100-000		SPECIAL TACTICAL UNIT DETACHMENT FACILITY				LS		2,140			
100-000		EUROPEAN GROUND STATION				LS		16,800			
100-000		VARIOUS FACILITIES				LS		2,060			
170-000		AIRCRAFT TRAINING FACILITIES				LS		2,000			
170-000		AIRCRAFT TRAINING FACILITIES				LS		5,200			
170-000		AIRCRAFT TRAINING FACILITIES				LS		2,100			
170-000		AIRCRAFT TRAINING FACILITIES				LS		9,600			
217-742		WAR READINESS MATERIEL MAINTENANCE/MANAGEMENT FAC				10,000 SF		1,300			
442-515		WAR READINESS MATERIEL MEDICAL STORAGE FACILITY				18,000 SF		1,800			
452-252		WAR READINESS MATERIEL OPEN STORAGE FACILITY				62,000 SF		1,200			
							TOTAL:		44,200		
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:											0
b. Water pollution:											0
c. Occupational safety and health:											0
d. Other Environmental:											0

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION CLASSIFIED LOCATION			4. PROJECT TITLE SPECIAL TACTICAL UNIT DETACHMENT FACILITY			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 2.72.48	6. CATEGORY CODE 100-000	7. PROJECT NUMBER PAYZ944445	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 5,540			
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
SPECIAL TACTICAL UNIT DETACHMENT FACILITY		LS			5,540	
SUBTOTAL					5,540	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					5,540	
TOTAL REQUEST					5,540	
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					5,540	
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Construct a Special Tactical Unit Detachment Facility.						
11. REQUIREMENT: As required. <u>REQUIREMENT</u> : See classified DD Form 1391.						

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)				2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION CLASSIFIED LOCATIONS			4. PROJECT TITLE OME A FACILITIES				
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 2.75.91		6. CATEGORY CODE 100-000	7. PROJECT NUMBER PAYZ944446		8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 2,600		
9. COST ESTIMATES							
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)		
OMEGA FACILITIES		LS			2,600		
SUBTOTAL					2,600		
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					2,600		
TOTAL REQUEST					2,600		
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					2,600		
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Construct OMEGA facilities.							
11. REQUIREMENT: As required. REQUIREMENT: See classified DD Form 1391.							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)					2. DATE			
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION BUCKLEY AIR NATIONAL GUARD BASE, COLORADO				4. COMMAND		5. AREA CONST COST INDEX 0.96				
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED		TOTAL
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	
a. As of 30 SEP 92		79	547	300						926
b. End FY 1998		76	522	311						909
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)										
a. Total Acreage: (3,897)										
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)		68,341								
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:		0								
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:		39,000								
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)		0								
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:		3,900								
g. Remaining Deficiency:		0								
h. Grand Total:		111,241								
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994										
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE			SCOPE		COST	DESIGN STATUS		
<u>CODE</u>							<u>(\$000)</u>	<u>START</u>		<u>CMPL</u>
131-134		DATA PROCESSING, RESEARCH, AND TRAINING FACILITY			217,700 SF		39,000	JUN 92		AUG 93
							TOTAL:		39,000	
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995) NONE										
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:										
890-272		INSTALL EMCS AND REPLACE HVAC IN TECH BUILDING			LS		3,900			
10. Mission or Major Functions: Colorado Air National Guard Headquarters with T-43s and the ANG 140th Tactical Fighter Wing flying a A-7D aircraft. Other units include 1810 Communications Group, 2 Communications Squadron and Det 3, Space Division.										
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:										
a. Air pollution:		0								
b. Water pollution:		0								
c. Occupational safety and health:		0								
d. Other Environmental:		0								

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION BUCKLEY AIR NATIONAL GUARD BASE, COLORADO			4. PROJECT TITLE DATA PROCESSING, RESEARCH, AND TRAINING FACILITY			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 3.41.11	6. CATEGORY CODE 131-134	7. PROJECT NUMBER CRWU939530	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 39,000			
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
DATA PROCESSING, RESEARCH, AND TRAINING FACILITY		SF	176,000	125	22,000	
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					12,700	
UTILITIES		LS			(5,000)	
PAVEMENTS		LS			(1,200)	
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(800)	
ENTRY CONTROL BUILDING		LS			(700)	
BACK-UP POWER		LS			(4,000)	
O&M MANUALS/COMMUNICATIONS SUPPORT		LS			(1,000)	
SUBTOTAL					34,700	
CONTINGENCY (5%)					1,735	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					36,435	
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					2,186	
TOTAL REQUEST					38,621	
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					39,000	
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Concrete foundation and floor slab, steel frame with precast concrete walls and built-up roof; includes large Sensitive Compartmented Information Facility (SCIF), raised flooring, entry control facility, pre-wired workstations , back-up generator, connection to EMCS and base utilities, upgrade of base utilities, paving and necessary support. Air Conditioning: 2000 Tons.						
11. REQUIREMENT: 200,000 SF ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 0 PROJECT: Construct a data processing facility. (New Mission) REQUIREMENT: A facility is required to provide the Department of Defense with physically and electronically secure space for processing and reporting classified data. The facility is required in support of a DX Brickbat FAD I priority program. It includes areas that will be staffed 24 hours per day as well as analysis and administrative areas, a SCIF area comprising more than half the building, and computer equipment areas. It will be staffed by approximately 750 military, civilian and contractor personnel. An entry control facility is required for perimeter security. The facility is required by June 1996. CURRENT SITUATION: This is a new requirement and suitable existing facilities are not available. IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: Without this facility, this new mission and its supporting capabilities cannot be performed. ADDITIONAL: There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". All known alternative options were considered during the development of this project. No other option could meet the mission requirements; therefore, no economic analysis was needed or performed.						

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION BUCKLEY AIR NATIONAL CUARD BASE, COLORADO																								
4. PROJECT TITLE DATA PROCESSING, RESEARCH, AND TRAINING FACILITY	5. PROJECT NUMBER CRWU939530																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="357 609 1427 745"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 JUN 12</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>30%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>93 FEB 12</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 AUG 12</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="357 798 1427 871"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="357 924 1427 1102"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>2320</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>1206</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>3526</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>200</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>3326</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 FEB</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 JUN 12	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	30%	(c) Date 35% Designed	93 FEB 12	(d) Date Design Complete	93 AUG 12	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	2320	(b) All Other Design Costs	1206	(c) Total	3526	(d) Contract	200	(e) In-house	3326
(a) Date Design Started	92 JUN 12																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	30%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	93 FEB 12																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 AUG 12																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	2320																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	1206																							
(c) Total	3526																							
(d) Contract	200																							
(e) In-house	3326																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)						2. DATE			
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN AIR FORCE BASE, COLORADO				4. COMMAND AIR FORCE SPACE COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX 1.08				
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			TOTAL
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	
a. As of 30 SEP 92		195	838	147							1,180
b. End FY 1998		187	767	146							1,100
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (519)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)											73,504
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:											0
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:											4,450
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)											0
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:											0
g. Remaining Deficiency:											0
h. Grand Total:											77,954
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE			SCOPE		COST (\$000)		DESIGN STATUS		
CODE									START		CMP
812-225		UPGRADE ELECTRICAL SERVICE			25,000 LF		4,450		NOV 92		SEP 93
							TOTAL:		4,450		
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995) NONE											
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
10. Mission or Major Functions: A support group; a command and control squadron; and the North American Defense Command command post.											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:											0
b. Water pollution:											0
c. Occupational safety and health:											0
d. Other Environmental:											0

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN AIR FORCE BASE, COLORADO		4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE ELECTRICAL SERVICE		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 3.59.96	6. CATEGORY CODE 812-225	7. PROJECT NUMBER SAXC943001	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 4,450	

9. COST ESTIMATES				
ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
UPGRADE ELECTRICAL SERVICE	LS			3,962
PRIMARY UNDERGROUND DIST LINE	LF	25,000	39	(975)
SUBSTATION	LS			(2,495)
SECONDARY FEEDERS	LF	6,000	82	(492)
SUPPORTING FACILITIES				10
SITE WORK	LS			(10)
SUBTOTAL				3,972
CONTINGENCY (5%)				199
TOTAL CONTRACT COST				4,171
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)				250
TOTAL REQUEST				4,421
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)				4,450

10. Description of Proposed Construction: Construct a new primary underground electrical feeder from the Bradley substation (city owned), replace the existing base substation transformers with higher capacity transformers, and upgrade secondary feeders from the substation to the interior complex.

11. REQUIREMENT: As required.
PROJECT: Increase the capacity of the Cheyenne Mountain AFB electrical substation and provide upgraded commercial electrical service to the mission centers by providing a new underground feeder. (Current Mission)
REQUIREMENT: Reliable electrical power (99.999 reliability) is required to support the NORAD command post and USSPACECOM operations centers which comprise the nerve center for warning of missile, space, or air attack on North America. The Federal Emergency Management Agency Control Center, which is also within the Cheyenne Mountain Complex (CMC), also requires reliable power. The importance of these missions requires that backup commercial power be as reliable as possible. Larger capacity transformers and secondary feeders are required to provide adequate redundant power to the mission support distribution system.
CURRENT SITUATION: The Cheyenne Mountain Complex currently operates with a combination of commercial and on-site generator power. Presently, the base power plant provides generator supplied power in support of mission requirements. The six 1750 KW generators of this facility are approaching 30 years of service and are operating at maximum designed capacity. In the event of a loss of generator capability, the mission centers in the complex would operate 100% on commercial power. Upgraded commercial electrical power is necessary to sustain the power demands of the mission centers should persistent generator failure occur. The current commercial

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN AIR FORCE BASE, COLORADO		
4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE ELECTRICAL SERVICE	5. PROJECT NUMBER SAXC943001	
<p>capability is limited to 5000 KVA and the near term (1993-1994) projected commercial requirement is 8500 KVA. A P-341 MILCON project has been approved for FY 92 to construct an additional power feeder from the installation's substation which will allow full use of the existing commercial substation capacity. While providing a temporary solution to the under-capacity problem, that project will not provide the full redundancy required for future operations. This lack of redundant capacity from the primary commercial source is not correctable without upgrading the present system, and is a threat to uninterrupted mission operations.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> A catastrophic power loss would be devastating to the US and Canada's ability to provide warning and assessment of tactical, sea-launched, and intercontinental missile launches, and to support such contingencies as Operation Desert Storm. If commercial service is interrupted for any of a number of reasons (lightning, downed lines, etc), the present commercial system would not be capable of meeting the total load and would require load shedding, resulting in possible disruption of mission-critical sensor and computer analysis systems which provide Missile Warning and Space Surveillance capabilities. The capability to sound the alarm of an attack may be jeopardized.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". No other known alternative options were acceptable; therefore, no economic analysis was needed or performed.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN AIR FORCE BASE, COLORADO																								
4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE ELECTRICAL SERVICE	5. PROJECT NUMBER SAXC943001																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="346 609 1404 745"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 NOV 18</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 DEC 23</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 SEP 30</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="346 808 1321 871"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="346 934 1404 1092"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>204</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>125</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>329</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>264</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>65</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 NOV 18	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 DEC 23	(d) Date Design Complete	93 SEP 30	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	204	(b) All Other Design Costs	125	(c) Total	329	(d) Contract	264	(e) In-house	65
(a) Date Design Started	92 NOV 18																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 DEC 23																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 SEP 30																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	204																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	125																							
(c) Total	329																							
(d) Contract	264																							
(e) In-house	65																							

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)						2. DATE				
AIR FORCE												
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION						4. COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX			
PETERSON AIR FORCE BASE, COLORADO						AIR FORCE			0.96			
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH						PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED
						OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	TOTAL
a. As of 30 SEP 92						1304	1828	1559	8	7	1	4,707
b. End FY 1998						1077	1548	1631	8	7	1	4,272
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)												
a. Total Acreage: (1,280)												
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)						139,870						
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:						32,350						
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:						21,030						
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)						19,050						
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:						45,800						
g. Remaining Deficiency:						0						
h. Grand Total:						258,100						
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994												
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE		SCOPE		COST (\$000)		DESIGN STATUS				
<u>CODE</u>								<u>START</u>	<u>CMPL</u>			
141-764	ADD TO AND ALTER INTEGRATION	SUPPORT FACILITY, PHASE II	104,000 SF	16,400	SEP 92	DEC 93						
218-868	PRECISION MEASUREMENT	EQUIPMENT LABORATORY	9,700 SF	2,200	NOV 92	AUG 93						
311-174	TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	FACILITY	12,400 SF	2,430	OCT 92	JUN 93						
						TOTAL:		21,030				
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995)												
141-459	COMMAND AND CONTROL SUPPORT	FACILITY, PHASE I	72,000 SF	8,000								
411-135	UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	16 EA	1,750									
610-249	ADD TO CONSOLIDATED WING	OPERATIONS & SUPPORT FACILITY	32,000 SF	5,300								
721-312	ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORY,	PHASE IV	134 PN	4,000								
						TOTAL:		19,050				
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:												
442-758	SUPPLY WAREHOUSE	84,000 SF	8,000									
610-249	SPACE SUPPORT CENTER	90,000 SF	10,800									
730-142	FIRE STATION	19,900 SF	4,000									
740-884	ADD TO AND ALTER CHILD CARE	CENTER	1,050 SF	1,000								
812-224	BASE ELECTRICAL UPGRADE	LS	6,000									
10. Mission or Major Functions: Headquarters United States Space Command; Headquarters Air Force Space Command; Headquarters North American Air Defense Command; Space and Warning Systems Center; AFSPACECOM Inspection Center; a space wing; an Air Force Reserve airlift wing (C-130 aircraft); and an Air Mobility Command airlift detachment (C-21 aircraft).												

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)							2. DATE			
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION PETERSON AIR FORCE BASE, COLORADO					4. COMMAND AIR FORCE SPACE COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX 0.96			
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			TOTAL
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	
a. As of											
b. End FY											
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage:											
b. Inventory Total As Of:											
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:											
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:											
e. Authorization Included In Following Program:											
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:											
g. Remaining Deficiency:											
h. Grand Total:											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:										0	
b. Water pollution:										1,750	
c. Occupational safety and health:										0	
d. Other Environmental:										0	

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION PETERSON AIR FORCE BASE, COLORADO			4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO AND ALTER INTEGRATION SUPPORT FACILITY, PHASE II			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 7.28.96	6. CATEGORY CODE 141-764	7. PROJECT NUMBER TDKA943005	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 16,400			
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
ADD TO AND ALTER INTEGRATION SUPPORT FACILITY, PHASE II		LS			11,700	
ADDITION		SF	104,000	110	(11,440)	
ALTERATION		LS			(260)	
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					2,995	
UTILITIES		LS			(580)	
PAVEMENTS		SY	12,000	34	(410)	
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(340)	
PRE-WIRED WORK STATIONS		EA	425	3,282	(1,395)	
COMMUNICATIONS SUPPORT		LS			(270)	
SUBTOTAL					14,695	
CONTINGENCY (5%)					735	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					15,430	
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					926	
TOTAL REQUEST					16,356	
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					16,400	
EQUIPMENT FROM OTHER APPROPRIATIONS (NON-ADD)					(10,700)	
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Concrete foundation and floor slab, masonry walls, steel frame, and roof system. Includes environmental controls, fire protection, TEMPEST security, SCIF areas, Top Secret storage vault, prewiring for communications, pre-wired work stations, utilities tie-in with existing building, and necessary support. Air Conditioning: 800 Tons.						
11. REQUIREMENT: 194,000 SF ADEQUATE: 90,000 SF SUBSTANDARD: 35,500 SF <u>PROJECT</u> : Add to and alter a centralized integration support facility, phase 2 of 2. (New Mission) <u>REQUIREMENT</u> : A centrally located facility is required to consolidate software engineering and logistical support to the following Space Command networks and systems using the extendible integration support environment: Integrated Threat Warning and Assessment, Space Defense Command and Control System, and Air Force Satellite Control Network. This facility is essential for maintaining the defense force readiness capability. It will provide logistical support to enable expeditious reaction to wartime scenarios. It will house hot mock-ups, simulators, special test equipment, automatic test equipment support systems and general support equipment, and the management and technical staffs necessary to provide systems support. This addition, the second phase of a two phase program, is required to complete consolidation of software engineering and logistical support functions. <u>CURRENT SITUATION</u> : The development and acquisition of space and warning computer systems and related technology is expanding faster than the ability to provide support space. Organic depot support facilities are almost non-existent for space systems. As a result, the Air Force must provide contractor depot engineering and maintenance for almost all space						

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION PETERSON AIR FORCE BASE, COLORADO		
4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO AND ALTER INTEGRATION SUPPORT FACILITY, PHASE II	5. PROJECT NUMBER TDKA943005	
<p>and warning systems in the inventory. Under the current contractor support situation, 22 separate activities must be operated to meet the software support requirement. Roughly half the facilities are contractor owned and operated, and must repeatedly be sole-source contracted to the original contractor. Phase I of this effort was authorized and appropriated in the FY 92 Military Construction Program.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Without completion of this two-phased effort, the capability to support wartime space requirements cannot be assured. Additionally, manpower and dollars will continue to be wasted due to inefficiencies and duplications-of-effort inherent in the current concept for sustained support of space and warning systems.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of new construction, revitalization, leasing and status quo operation. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, new construction was found to be the most cost efficient over the life of the project. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide" or in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements".</p>		

1. COMPONENT	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE	
AIR FORCE			
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION			
PETERSON AIR FORCE BASE, COLORADO			
4. PROJECT TITLE		5. PROJECT NUMBER	
ADD TO AND ALTER INTEGRATION SUPPORT FACILITY, PHASE II		TDKA943005	
12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:			
a. Estimated Design Data:			
(1) Status:			
(a) Date Design Started		92 SEP 16	
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%	
(c) Date 35% Designed		92 DEC 16	
(d) Date Design Complete		93 DEC 30	
(2) Basis:			
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		YES	
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		PETERSON	
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)			
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		1010	
(b) All Other Design Costs		327	
(c) Total		1337	
(d) Contract		998	
(e) In-house		339	
(4) Construction Start		94 MAR	
b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations:			
EQUIPMENT NOMENCLATURE	PROCURING APPROPRIATION	FISCAL YEAR APPROPRIATED OR REQUESTED	COST (\$000)
LOCAL AREA NETWORK EQUIP	3080	1995	600
UPS EQUIPMENT	3080	1995	760
SECURITY EQUIPMENT	3080	1995	500
EXPANDABLE INTERGRATED SUPPORT EQUIPMENT (EISE)	3080	1995	10700

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION PETERSON AIR FORCE BASE, COLORADO			4. PROJECT TITLE PRECISION MEASUREMENT EQUIPMENT LABORATORY			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 3.59.96	6. CATEGORY CODE 218-868	7. PROJECT NUMBER TDKA923008	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 2,200			
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
PRECISION MEASUREMENT EQUIPMENT LABORATORY		SF	9,700	175	1,698	
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					265	
UTILITIES		LS			(95)	
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(85)	
PAVEMENTS		LS			(85)	
SUBTOTAL					1,963	
CONTINGENCY (5%)					98	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					2,061	
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					124	
TOTAL REQUEST					2,185	
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					2,200	
EQUIPMENT FROM OTHER APPROPRIATIONS (NON-ADD)					(500)	
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Reinforced concrete foundation with vibration-damping floor slab, steel frame with masonry walls, roof system, all utilities and necessary support facilities. Air Conditioning: 35 Tons.						
11. REQUIREMENT: 9,700 SF ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 5,080 SF PROJECT: Construct a new Precision Measurement Equipment Laboratory (PMEL). (New Mission) REQUIREMENT: A facility with environmental controls to assure rigid control of temperature, moisture and dust. This facility is required for field level maintenance, calibration and certification of precision measurement equipment for active duty and Air Force Reserve units stationed within the Peterson AFB, Falcon AFB, Cheyenne Mountain AFB, and numerous sites including the AFSPACECOM unit at Buckley ANGB. CURRENT SITUATION: The existing facility has had two additions, each with a separate HVAC system, and the facility is now unable to maintain the proper environment within acceptable limits. Configuration of the rooms does not allow efficient layout of existing equipment; and it will not accommodate the equipment which will be added in the next five years to support the AFMC new mission for systems development (Pacer Frontier) and new DoD missions at Falcon AFB. The space needed to house over \$500,000 of newly required equipment, on order to support new missions at Falcon AFB and Peterson AFB, does not exist in the present facility. In addition some existing equipment, such as the Radiac Unit (radioactive timing calibration), cannot be properly used due to inadequate space. The receiving and storage area is undersized; equipment and cases are stored in work areas. The inventory of items supported is projected to increase from 3,400 to 4,900 items. New mission requirements call for a fiber						

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION PETERSON AIR FORCE BASE, COLORADO		
4. PROJECT TITLE PRECISION MEASUREMENT EQUIPMENT LABORATORY	5. PROJECT NUMBER TDKA923008	
<p>optics lab which will require an additional 1,000 SF. The equipment utilized is vibration sensitive, and it is not economically feasible to renovate the existing structure to the extent necessary to achieve the proper, vibration-free environment.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> With the increase in new items to be tested and the addition of new testing equipment, the PMEL's production quality and ability to perform accurate measurements will be impaired. Backlogs and work stoppages can result, ultimately causing an adverse effect on missions supported and loss of certification as a PMEL lab. Failure to calibrate equipment without proper lab standards will result in errors that will affect the ability to operate the missions without error.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facilities Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements". All known alternative options were considered during the development of this project. No other option could meet the mission requirements; therefore, no economic analysis was needed or performed.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																														
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION PETERSON AIR FORCE BASE, COLORADO																																
4. PROJECT TITLE PRECISION MEASUREMENT EQUIPMENT LABORATORY	5. PROJECT NUMBER TDKA923008																															
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="363 609 1445 745"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 NOV 14</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 DEC 23</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 AUG 01</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="363 798 1445 871"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="363 924 1445 1092"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>130</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>70</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>200</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>165</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>35</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations:</p> <table data-bbox="198 1365 1445 1575"> <thead> <tr> <th>EQUIPMENT NOMENCLATURE</th> <th>PROCURING APPROPRIATION</th> <th>FISCAL YEAR APPROPRIATED OR REQUESTED</th> <th>COST (\$000)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>PRECISION MEASURING INSTRUMENTATION</td> <td>3080</td> <td>FY94</td> <td>500</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			(a) Date Design Started	92 NOV 14	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 DEC 23	(d) Date Design Complete	93 AUG 01	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	130	(b) All Other Design Costs	70	(c) Total	200	(d) Contract	165	(e) In-house	35	EQUIPMENT NOMENCLATURE	PROCURING APPROPRIATION	FISCAL YEAR APPROPRIATED OR REQUESTED	COST (\$000)	PRECISION MEASURING INSTRUMENTATION	3080	FY94	500
(a) Date Design Started	92 NOV 14																															
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																															
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 DEC 23																															
(d) Date Design Complete	93 AUG 01																															
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																															
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																															
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	130																															
(b) All Other Design Costs	70																															
(c) Total	200																															
(d) Contract	165																															
(e) In-house	35																															
EQUIPMENT NOMENCLATURE	PROCURING APPROPRIATION	FISCAL YEAR APPROPRIATED OR REQUESTED	COST (\$000)																													
PRECISION MEASURING INSTRUMENTATION	3080	FY94	500																													

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)				2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION PETERSON AIR FORCE BASE, COLORADO			4. PROJECT TITLE TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT FACILITY				
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 9.12.12S		6. CATEGORY CODE 311-174	7. PROJECT NUMBER TDKA913001		8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 2,430		
9. COST ESTIMATES							
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)		
TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT FACILITY		SF	12,400	140	1,736		
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					445		
COMMUNICATIONS SUPPORT		LS			(40)		
UTILITIES		LS			(265)		
PAVEMENTS		LS			(55)		
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(85)		
SUBTOTAL					2,181		
CONTINGENCY (5%)					109		
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					2,290		
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					137		
TOTAL REQUEST					2,427		
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					2,430		
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Energy-efficient, single-story, flat-roofed, masonry building with concrete foundation and floor. Metal stud interior walls, interior finishes, utilities, and wiring to support existing workstations. Air Conditioning: 35 Tons.							
11. REQUIREMENT: 12,400 SF ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 10,000 SF PROJECT: Construct a test and evaluation support facility. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: This project is required to support centralized management and supervision of all Joint Services operational test and evaluation (OT&E) programs in the Colorado Springs area. The facility will house 80 permanent party personnel (and the associated computer equipment) responsible for the new expanded mission of planning, conducting, and reporting all initial, qualification, and additional follow-on and joint operational test and evaluation for Air Force Space Command. The expanded testing will continue for the foreseeable future and serve other organizations, including the Consolidated Space Operations Center, NAVSTAR/Ground Positioning System Space and Control Segment, MILSTAR, Cheyenne Mountain Upgrade, and SDI support. In addition to the HQ AFOTEC conducted tests, Detachment 4 has assumed responsibility for test programs formerly conducted by the MAJCOMs. This rapid increase in the number of programs needing OT&E requires an efficient, adequate facility. CURRENT SITUATION: The detachment currently occupies a substandard, leased, temporary facility under a SAF/MII waiver. This facility is energy inefficient, poorly configured, undersized, and fails to meet the needs of the OT&E function. Some of the personnel occupy leased office space as additional suitable space is unavailable on Peterson. The							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION PETERSON AIR FORCE BASE, COLORADO		
4. PROJECT TITLE TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT FACILITY	5. PROJECT NUMBER TDKA913001	
<p>current lease will expire Jan 1993, and new lease costs are expected to increase.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> HQ AFOTEC will expend valuable O&M dollars to continue to lease and maintain the temporary facility and the office space in a time of decreasing funding. Travel time between the two locations will reduce productivity and jeopardize test schedules that are based upon 100% work effort.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> The project meets the criteria specified in Part II of the Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide."</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION PETERSON AIR FORCE BASE, COLORADO																								
4. PROJECT TITLE TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT FACILITY	5. PROJECT NUMBER TDKA913001																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="346 609 1404 745"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 OCT 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 DEC 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 JUN 18</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="346 808 1321 871"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="346 934 1404 1092"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>145</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>105</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>250</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>200</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>50</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 OCT 01	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 DEC 01	(d) Date Design Complete	93 JUN 18	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	145	(b) All Other Design Costs	105	(c) Total	250	(d) Contract	200	(e) In-house	50
(a) Date Design Started	92 OCT 01																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 DEC 01																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 JUN 18																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	145																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	105																							
(c) Total	250																							
(d) Contract	200																							
(e) In-house	50																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)						2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY, COLORADO				4. COMMAND UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX 1.05		
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED		TOTAL
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV		
a. As of 30 SEP 92		1110	1230	1632		4482	190		8,644
b. End FY 1998		1078	1164	1644		4182	190		8,258
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)									
a. Total Acreage: (54,296)									
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)		326,420							
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:		22,260							
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:		11,680							
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)		10,900							
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:		84,700							
g. Remaining Deficiency:		0							
h. Grand Total:		455,960							
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994									
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE			SCOPE	COST (\$000)	DESIGN STATUS		
CODE						START	Cmpl		
211-111	ENHANCED FLIGHT SCREENER HANGARS			27,500 SF	3,800	SEP 92	AUG 93		
411-135	UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS			11 EA	780	APR 92	DEC 93		
831-168	ADD TO AND ALTER WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT			LS	7,100	SEP 92	DEC 93		
					TOTAL:	11,680			
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995)									
211-000	AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE			11,200 SF	2,250				
740-884	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER			25,100 SF	4,000				
821-117	REPLACE HEATING FACILITIES			22,350 MB	4,650				
					TOTAL:	10,900			
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:									
171-475	CONSTRUCT NEW CLASSROOM/ ADMIN BUILDING FOR PREP SCHOOL			18,845 SF	2,050				
171-853	RENOVATE USAF ACADEMY ACADEMIC TRAINING FACILITY, PHASE 3			156,765 SF	14,400				
211-111	REPLACE SAILPLANE HANGAR			15,200 SF	2,050				
610-284	RENOVATE MAJOR COMMAND HEADQUARTERS			60,000 SF	4,300				
841-425	POTABLE WATER TANK			2,000 KG	1,900				
10. Mission or Major Functions: Responsible for providing education and training for cadets to become Air Force officers and includes an Air Training Command flying training squadron with T-41 aircraft.									
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:									
a. Air pollution:		0							
b. Water pollution:		0							
c. Occupational safety and health:		0							
d. Other Environmental:		0							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY, COLORADO			4. PROJECT TITLE ENHANCED FLIGHT SCREENER HANGARS			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 8.47.48	6. CATEGORY CODE 211-111	7. PROJECT NUMBER XQPZ930029	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 3,800			
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
ENHANCED FLIGHT SCREENER HANGARS		SF	28,400	105	2,982	
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					450	
UTILITIES		LS			(100)	
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(50)	
PAVEMENTS		LS			(250)	
UNDERGROUND WASTE OIL TANK		LS			(50)	
SUBTOTAL					3,432	
CONTINGENCY (5%)					172	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					3,604	
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					216	
TOTAL REQUEST					3,820	
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					3,800	
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Reinforced concrete footings, foundation and floor slab, pre-cast concrete T-walls, insulated walls and roof, fire detection system, utilities, underground waste oil tank, asphalt paving and other necessary support.						
11. REQUIREMENT: 69,350 SF ADEQUATE: 40,950 SF SUBSTANDARD: 0 <u>PROJECT:</u> Construct hangars and required ramp for Enhanced Flight Screener aircraft. (New Mission) <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> Provide hangars to shelter Enhanced Flight Screener (EFS) aircraft (commercial specifications) from blowing sand, wind and hail damage as well as to perform necessary maintenance. The EFS program will implement new and additional types of sorties not possible with existing aircraft. Special features inherent with the EFS will require increased maintenance and, therefore, additional maintenance bays. The EFS aircraft will be used in a mandatory screening program for prospective pilots. Ramp space will be required for aircraft maneuvering and access to existing runways. <u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> In 1993, the Academy will receive 56 new EFS aircraft to replace 50 T-41 aircraft through a commercial, off-the-shelf procurement by ATC. Current hangar space will shelter only 34 EFS aircraft due to dimensional and wing configuration differences compared with the T-41. The remaining aircraft will be stored outside, vulnerable to 65+ knot winds, sand, temperature extremes, and hail damage. Although similar commercial aircraft can withstand up to 3/4 inch hail, the Academy experiences hail greater than 3/4 inch approximately four times per year. Winds at the Academy exceed 50 knots on the average of 22 times per year. Within the Colorado Springs and Denver areas, all owners of similar aircraft hangar planes from this extreme environment or carry insurance to						

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY, COLORADO		
4. PROJECT TITLE ENHANCED FLIGHT SCREENER HANGARS	5. PROJECT NUMBER XQPZ930029	
<p>fix or replace the aircraft.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Without hangars, one hailstorm with greater than 3/4 inch hailstones will ground the 22 unsheltered EFS aircraft. If the aircraft are damaged and unavailable, proper screening and training cannot occur, which seriously impacts the mission. The EFS aircraft must be able to withstand up to six Gs; therefore, skin or structural damage from hail is a safety hazard and will require immediate repairs. If the damage is widespread, as in the case of a hailstorm, replacement of the wings and fuselage parts may be necessary.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> By making this purchase of off-the-shelf commercial aircraft, the Air Force will save between \$30 and \$50 million in development costs. Replacement value for the 22 EFS is \$4.4 million. An economic analysis has been prepared comparing alternatives of new construction, addition to existing hangars, hangaring at nearby Peterson AFB and status quo operation. The existing airfield configuration restricts any additions to the existing hangars, and Peterson AFB does not have additional hangar space available. Based on the new present value and benefits of the alternatives, status quo appears to be more cost effective. However, status quo will not support the current mission to screen cadets for pilot training. Also actual historical maintenance/repair costs on the EFS do not exist since it is a new aircraft and T-41 data are not applicable. Therefore, the analysis cannot accurately compare the two alternatives.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY, COLORADO																								
4. PROJECT TITLE ENHANCED FLIGHT SCREENER HANGARS	5. PROJECT NUMBER XQP2930029																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="330 609 1404 756"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 SEP 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 OCT 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 AUG 01</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="330 798 1404 882"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="330 924 1404 1102"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>228</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>124</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>352</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>180</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>172</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 SEP 15	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 OCT 15	(d) Date Design Complete	93 AUG 01	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	228	(b) All Other Design Costs	124	(c) Total	352	(d) Contract	180	(e) In-house	172
(a) Date Design Started	92 SEP 15																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 OCT 15																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 AUG 01																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	228																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	124																							
(c) Total	352																							
(d) Contract	180																							
(e) In-house	172																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE			
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY, COLORADO				4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO AND ALTER WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT				
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 8.57.56A		6. CATEGORY CODE 831-168	7. PROJECT NUMBER XQPZ940065		8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 7,100			
9. COST ESTIMATES								
ITEM					U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
ADD TO AND ALTER WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT					LS			4,404
ADDITION					LS			(1,530)
ALTERATION					LS			(2,874)
SUPPORTING FACILITIES								1,975
DEMOLITION					LS			(260)
PIPING					LS			(585)
EXTERIOR LIGHTING					LS			(80)
O&M MANUALS					LS			(125)
SITE WORK					LS			(925)
SUBTOTAL								6,379
CONTINGENCY (5%)								319
TOTAL CONTRACT COST								6,698
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)								402
TOTAL REQUEST								7,100
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)								7,100
10. Description of Proposed Construction: New construction includes headworks, primary clarifier, sludge thickener, primary effluent diversion structure, and operations building. Alterations include secondary treatment improvements, chlorine contact basin expansion, electrical system upgrade, and replacement of digester boiler/heat exchanger and equipment. Also includes start-up training and O&M manuals.								
11. REQUIREMENT: As required. PROJECT: Add to and alter the existing wastewater treatment plant. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: This is a Level I environmental compliance project to correct plant deficiencies that prevent the plant from meeting the 30 ppm biochemical oxygen demand (BOD) discharge limit per NPDES permit. Also, this project will ensure that the plant meets the planned changes to the NPDES permit when renewed Mar 1993 and complies with additional State of Colorado requirements for irrigation using the plant's effluent. The effluent from the wastewater treatment plant is required to meet State of Colorado and Federal wastewater treatment and pollution standards. CURRENT SITUATION: The existing wastewater plant was designed in 1957 to process a 4.5M gallons/day peak flow of raw wastewater. However, the regular flow surges caused by the schedule of the cadets and the high associated wastewater strength make it difficult for the plant to adequately remove organic material from the wastewater. The waste leaving the cadet dining facility is extremely high in organic strength and is discharged over short periods of time. The average BOD entering the treatment plant during a maximum month loading situation when the cadets are present is nearly 600 ppm. The requirement of effluent BOD of 30 ppm has not been reliably met for many years. The condition of the plant's								

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY, COLORADO		
4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO AND ALTER WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT	5. PROJECT NUMBER XQPZ940065	
<p>treatment units is poor. The plant's oxidation unit has not been in use for a number of years due to design deficiencies. The wastewater loading on the plant is higher than the plant's current treatment capacity. Upgrading the 34-year-old plant will allow it to meet current and projected permit limits. The Colorado Department of Health (CDH) will impose more stringent reuse standards, and the treatment plant must be upgraded to meet these requirements. Also, the Academy may need to divert a well-defined runoff stream that flows into the first of four non-potable storage reservoirs (sources of irrigation) around that reservoir in order to prevent the EPA from considering it a "Water of the US". The fourth reservoir in the Academy's system will be considered a Water of the US, and the EPA will require Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing (aquatic life) on treated effluent that is discharged to it. In the future, the plant might not be allowed to discharge into nearby Monument Creek in order not to exceed the standard for inorganic nitrogen in the creek.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> The treatment plant currently does not comply with its existing NPDES discharge limits most of the time. As state and Federal wastewater pollution standards become more stringent (adoption of more stringent standards for irrigation and Waters of the US classification), the treatment plant will be in violation of even more discharge permit provisions. There also is a high potential for mechanical/electrical failure due to equipment age, which would result in further violation of permit limits or in a potentially illegal discharge into Monument Creek. A discharge into Monument Creek could result in pollution, incurring environmental violations/fines, and other actions.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There are no criteria for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, " Facility Planning and Design Guide." However, this project does meet the criteria specified in the Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements." An economic analysis has been prepared comparing alternatives of new construction, upgrading, sending waste to the City of Colorado Springs, and status quo operation. Based on the new present value and benefits of the respective alternatives, upgrading is more cost effective over the life of the project. From 1965 to 1971, several upgrades to the plant were completed. They included the addition of a primary and two final clarifiers, a primary digester, and an oxidation tank. The latest upgrade in 1987 added a flow equalization unit.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY, COLORADO																								
4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO AND ALTER WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT	5. PROJECT NUMBER XQPZ940065																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 SEP 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 OCT 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 DEC 01</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>438</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>219</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>657</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>438</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>219</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 APR</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 SEP 15	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 OCT 01	(d) Date Design Complete	93 DEC 01	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	438	(b) All Other Design Costs	219	(c) Total	657	(d) Contract	438	(e) In-house	219
(a) Date Design Started	92 SEP 15																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 OCT 01																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 DEC 01																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	438																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	219																							
(c) Total	657																							
(d) Contract	438																							
(e) In-house	219																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)							2. DATE			
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION DOVER AIR FORCE BASE, DELAWARE					4. COMMAND AIR MOBILITY COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX 1.02			
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			TOTAL
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	
a. As of 30 SEP 92		380	3816	1258	64	414	61	2	17	1	6,013
b. End FY 1998		375	3601	1423	64	414	61	2	17	1	5,958
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (3,905)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)		211,185									
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:		42,310									
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:		6,560									
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)		1,750									
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:		27,750									
g. Remaining Deficiency:		0									
h. Grand Total:		289,555									
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE		SCOPE		COST (\$000)		DESIGN STATUS			
CODE								START		Cmpl	
211-159		INSTALL EMISSION CONTROL DEVICES		LS		860		OCT 92		JUL 93	
721-312		DORMITORY (DBOF)		125 PN		3,200		AUG 92		AUG 93	
722-351		ADD TO AND ALTER DINING FACILITY (DBOF)		17,850 SF		2,500		JAN 93		NOV 93	
TOTAL:						6,560					
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995)											
141-784		ADD TO AND ALTER AIR PASSENGER TERMINAL		LS		1,750					
TOTAL:						1,750					
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
130-142		FIRE/CRASH RESCUE STATION		14,500 SF		2,300					
610-121		VEHICLE OPERATIONS ADMIN		4,100 SF		800					
721-312		UNACCOMPANIED ENLISTED HSG		350 PN		4,400					
721-312		UNACCOMPANIED ENLISTED HSG		350 PN		9,000					
740-674		ADD TO AND ALTER PHYSICAL FITNESS CENTER		19,600 SF		2,900					
10. Mission or Major Functions: An airlift wing which includes three C-5 squadrons; an Air Force Reserve C-5 associate airlift wing; and the largest aerial port on the east coast. Also, a joint military/civil use airfield.											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:		0									
b. Water pollution:		0									
c. Occupational safety and health:		0									
d. Other Environmental:		0									

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)				2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION DOVER AIR FORCE BASE, DELAWARE			4. PROJECT TITLE DORMITORY (DBOF)				
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 4.18.96		6. CATEGORY CODE 721-312	7. PROJECT NUMBER FJXT943005		8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 3,200		
9. COST ESTIMATES							
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)		
DORMITORY (DBOF)		SF	25,000	90	2,250		
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					630		
UTILITIES		LS			(165)		
PAVEMENTS		LS			(165)		
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(115)		
DEMOLITION		SF	30,900	6	(185)		
SUBTOTAL					2,880		
CONTINGENCY (5%)					144		
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					3,024		
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					181		
TOTAL REQUEST					3,205		
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					3,200		
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Reinforced concrete foundation and floor slabs, masonry walls and roof. Includes room-bath-room modules, laundries, storage and lounge areas and all supporting facilities. Air Conditioning: 100 Tons. Grade Mix: 175 E1-E4.							
11. REQUIREMENT: 1,787 PN ADEQUATE: 901 PN SUBSTANDARD: 1,624 PN PROJECT: Construct a dormitory. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: A major Air Force objective is to provide unaccompanied enlisted personnel with housing conducive to their proper rest, relaxation and personal well-being. Properly designed and furnished quarters providing some degree of individual privacy are essential to the successful accomplishment of the increasingly complicated and important jobs these people must perform. CURRENT SITUATION: There are currently not enough adequate dormitories to meet the billeting requirements of unaccompanied enlisted personnel at this base. Substandard facilities to be replaced are semi-permanent, modular facilities which do not provide semi-private baths, adequate control of heating and air conditioning, sufficient noise attenuation or necessary amenities to adequately house enlisted personnel. This project is the fourth phase of a six phase program to provide adequate dormitories at this base. Current occupancy rate of dorms at Dover is 98 percent. Three substandard facilities which house 106 personnel will be disposed of upon completion of this project. IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: Adequate living quarters will continue to be unavailable resulting in degradation of morale, productivity, and career satisfaction for unaccompanied enlisted personnel. ADDITIONAL: This project meets the criteria/scope specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". A							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION DOVER AIR FORCE BASE, DELAWARE		
4. PROJECT TITLE DORMITORY (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER FJXT943005	
<p>life-cycle economic analysis has been performed comparing all reasonable options for accomplishing this project (status quo, renovation, and new construction). This analysis indicates the new construction alternative is the most economical. Project has been considered for FY97 force structure end strength.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION DOVER AIR FORCE BASE, DELAWARE																								
4. PROJECT TITLE DORMITORY (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER FJXT943005																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="330 609 1404 756"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 AUG 12</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>93 JAN 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 AUG 23</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="330 798 1404 882"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="330 924 1404 1102"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>192</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>208</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>400</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>78</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>322</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 AUG 12	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	93 JAN 15	(d) Date Design Complete	93 AUG 23	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	192	(b) All Other Design Costs	208	(c) Total	400	(d) Contract	78	(e) In-house	322
(a) Date Design Started	92 AUG 12																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	93 JAN 15																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 AUG 23																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	192																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	208																							
(c) Total	400																							
(d) Contract	78																							
(e) In-house	322																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)		2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION DOVER AIR FORCE BASE, DELAWARE		4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO AND ALTER DINING FACILITY (DBOF)	
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 4.18.96	6. CATEGORY CODE 722-351	7. PROJECT NUMBER FJXT933000	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 2,500

9. COST ESTIMATES				
ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
ADD TO AND ALTER DINING FACILITY (DBOF)	SF	15,950		1,738
ADDITION	SF	1,150	160	(184)
ALTERATION	SF	14,800	105	(1,554)
SUPPORTING FACILITIES				420
UTILITIES	LS			(200)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS	LS			(75)
PAVEMENTS	LS			(110)
ASBESTOS REMOVAL	LS			(35)
SUBTOTAL				2,158
CONTINGENCY (10%)				216
TOTAL CONTRACT COST				2,374
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)				142
TOTAL REQUEST				2,516
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)				2,500

10. Description of Proposed Construction: Reinforced concrete foundation and floor slab and roof panels. All electrical, mechanical, and structural work necessary to reconfigure existing kitchen, serving area and dining area.

Air Conditioning: 30 Tons.

11. REQUIREMENT: 17,800 SF ADEQUATE: 1,850 SF SUBSTANDARD: 14,800 SF

PROJECT: Add to and alter dining facility. (Current Mission)

REQUIREMENT: Adequate space is required for food preparation, serving line, dishwashing equipment, dining area, and storage of perishable and non-perishable food.

CURRENT SITUATION: The dining hall activities are presently being conducted in a facility that is too small and not properly configured to support assigned and transient personnel. Inefficiencies include 17-year-old outdated serving line equipment, lack of adequate sanitation, and inadequately sized or configured dining and kitchen area which does not permit optimal use of existing space. The existing dining facility was constructed in 1975. Subsequent to this construction, sanitation standards have changed in kitchen washing and cleaning operations which cannot be met due to the design and equipment layout. Insufficient storage space for pots and pans has caused medical write-ups for sanitation discrepancies. Additional space is required for patron seating. Lack of adequate seating space and food serving line causes unnecessary delays for personnel who are on meal breaks from their jobs.

IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: Dining hall operations will continue to be performed in a substandard and overcrowded facility. Morale of our personnel will continue to be adversely impacted if they are forced to take meals in such an inadequate and unattractive facility.

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION DOVER AIR FORCE BASE, DELAWARE		
4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO AND ALTER DINING FACILITY (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER FJXT933000	
<p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> This project meets the criteria/scope specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". A life-cycle economic analysis has been performed comparing all reasonable options for accomplishing this project (status quo, addition/alteration and new construction). This analysis indicates the addition/alteration alternative is the most economical. Project has been considered for FY97 force structure end strength.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION DOVER AIR FORCE BASE, DELAWARE																								
4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO AND ALTER DINING FACILITY (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER FJXT933000																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="376 625 1425 751"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 JUL 17</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 SEP 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 NOV 22</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="376 814 1344 877"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="376 940 1425 1098"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>150</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>100</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>250</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>170</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>80</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 MAR</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 JUL 17	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 SEP 01	(d) Date Design Complete	93 NOV 22	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	150	(b) All Other Design Costs	100	(c) Total	250	(d) Contract	170	(e) In-house	80
(a) Date Design Started	92 JUL 17																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 SEP 01																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 NOV 22																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	150																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	100																							
(c) Total	250																							
(d) Contract	170																							
(e) In-house	80																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)							2. DATE			
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION BOLLING AIR FORCE BASE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA				4. COMMAND AIR FORCE DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON				5. AREA CONST COST INDEX 1.05			
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			TOTAL
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	
a. As of 30 SEP 92		566	1517	978	392	390	80	210	1222		5,355
b. End FY 1998		559	1432	948	392	390	80	210	1222		5,233
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (607)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)											241,941
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:											9,400
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:											2,000
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)											0
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:											36,000
g. Remaining Deficiency:											0
h. Grand Total:											289,341
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE			SCOPE		COST (\$000)	DESIGN STATUS			
<u>CODE</u>								<u>START</u>		<u>CMPL</u>	
740-884		ADD TO CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER			16,200 SF		2,000	SEP 92		JUL 93	
							TOTAL:		2,000		
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995) NONE											
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
721-312		ALTER DORMITORIES			975 PN		4,000				
721-312		UNACCOMPANIED ENLISTED HSG			200 PN		6,000				
724-415		REPLACE VISITORS QUARTERS			100 PN		3,500				
730-441		CONSOLIDATED SUPPORT CENTER			80,000 SF		15,000				
740-674		ADD TO AND ALTER PHYSICAL FITNESS CENTER			17,000 SF		1,800				
10. Mission or Major Functions: Supports Air Force personnel in the National Capitol Region. Headquarters USAF functions include Chief of Chaplains, Surgeon General, and Historian; Headquarters Air Force Office of Special Investigation; Air Force Office of Scientific Research; Air Force Legal Services Agency; Air Force Medical Support Agency; USAF Band; and USAF Honor Guard. Major tenants include the Defense Intelligence Agency.											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:											0
b. Water pollution:											0
c. Occupational safety and health:											0
d. Other Environmental:											0

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)		2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION BOLLING AIR FORCE BASE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 9.12.12S	6. CATEGORY CODE 740-884	7. PROJECT NUMBER BXUR870202	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 2,000

9. COST ESTIMATES				
ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
ADD TO CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	SF	16,200	105	1,701
SUPPORTING FACILITIES				115
UTILITIES	LS			(15)
PAVEMENTS	LS			(25)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS	LS			(75)
SUBTOTAL				1,816
CONTINGENCY (5%)				91
TOTAL CONTRACT COST				1,907
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)				114
TOTAL REQUEST				2,021
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)				2,000

10. Description of Proposed Construction: Reinforced concrete foundation and floor slab, electrical, mechanical and ventilation system, and fire protection system. Area includes playrooms with bathrooms sized for both adults and children.

11. REQUIREMENT: 30,000 SF ADEQUATE: 13,755 SF SUBSTANDARD: 0
PROJECT: Add to child development center. (Current Mission)
REQUIREMENT: To provide adequate child care and preschool facilities for dependent children.
CURRENT SITUATION: The capacity of the existing Child Development Center is limited to 208 children. The center currently has a waiting list of 350 children. Because of the large number of children, the center normally is filled to capacity early in the morning, causing parents in need of child care after this time to find other services in the civilian community. Because of space non-availability, implementation of the six-week through six-month-old infant program is being delayed indefinitely. Other programs, such as the summer youth program for school-age children and kindergarten programs, are being conducted in the Youth Center which issacrificing youth activity programs.
IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: Military personnel and their dependents must continue using less than adequate facilities and the waiting list will continue to grow. The six-week to six-month-old infant program will be delayed indefinitely. Youth center activities will continue to be hamperedbecause of space being utilized by the Child Development Center.
ADDITIONAL: An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of status quo, expansion and new construction. Expansion will provide the additional space needed at the Child Development Center at the lower life cycle cost. Therefore, expansion was the recommended

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION BOLLING AIR FORCE BASE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		
4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	5. PROJECT NUMBER BXUR870202	
alternative.		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION BOLLING AIR FORCE BASE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA																								
4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	5. PROJECT NUMBER BXUR870202																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="330 609 1404 756"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 SEP 02</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>93 JAN 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 NOV 08</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="330 798 1404 882"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="330 924 1404 1102"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>120</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>60</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>180</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>120</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>60</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 MAR</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 SEP 02	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	93 JAN 01	(d) Date Design Complete	93 NOV 08	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	120	(b) All Other Design Costs	60	(c) Total	180	(d) Contract	120	(e) In-house	60
(a) Date Design Started	92 SEP 02																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	93 JAN 01																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 NOV 08																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	120																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	60																							
(c) Total	180																							
(d) Contract	120																							
(e) In-house	60																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)					2. DATE			
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION CAPE CANAVERAL AIR FORCE STATION, FLORIDA			4. COMMAND AIR FORCE SPACE COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX 0.91				
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED		TOTAL
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	
a. As of 30 SEP 92		115	171	185				18	138	627
b. End FY 1998		121	173	177				18	138	627
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)										
a. Total Acreage: (20,156)										
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)		412,611								
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:		70,153								
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:		19,200								
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)		17,150								
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:		23,900								
g. Remaining Deficiency:		0								
h. Grand Total:		543,014								
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994										
CATEGORY					COST		DESIGN STATUS			
<u>CODE</u>	<u>PROJECT TITLE</u>	<u>SCOPE</u>			<u>(\$000)</u>	<u>START</u>	<u>CMPL</u>			
411-135	UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	LS			400	TURN KEY				
811-145	SLFI - BACKUP POWER	LS			2,500	SEP 92	AUG 93			
811-147	SLFI - BACKUP POWER	LS			800	AUG 92	AUG 93			
831-165	SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT	800 KG			11,900	OCT 91	SEP 93			
842-245	SLFI - UPGRADE WATER SUPPLY MAINS	LS			1,200					
880-233	SLFI - UPGRADE FIRE SYSTEM	LS			2,400	SEP 92	AUG 93			
					TOTAL:	19,200				
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995)										
141-626	WEATHER STATION	33,300 SF			5,600					
219-944	CORROSION CONTROL FACILITY	6,000 SF			1,850					
610-811	DELTA CENTRALIZED FACILITY	25,000 SF			4,500					
812-224	UPGRADE POWER, SLC 36-A	LS			1,850					
890-272	SLFI - UPGRADE ENERGY MANAGEMENT AND CONTROL SYSTEM	LS			3,350					
					TOTAL:	17,150				
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:										
312-477	GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM RESEARCH FACILITY	20,000 SF			3,400					
371-000	LAUNCH TERMINAL SUPPORT FACILITY	100,000 SF			10,000					
442-758	HIGH VALUE ITEM STORAGE	25,000 SF			6,000					
831-165	SEWAGE TREATMENT & DISPOSAL	LS			4,000					
890-161	UTILITY SUPPORT BUILDING	LS			500					
10. Mission or Major Functions: A space launch squadron and space systems squadron which support operational and test launches of missiles, satellites, and space vehicles in equatorial and synchronous orbits. Also, supports interplanetary space activities, and major tenants such as NASA, and Army, Navy and Coast Guard units.										

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)						2. DATE			
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION CAPE CANAVERAL AIR FORCE STATION, FLORIDA					4. COMMAND AIR FORCE SPACE COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX 0.91			
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			TOTAL
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	
a. As of											
b. End FY											
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage:											
b. Inventory Total As Of:											
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:											
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:											
e. Authorization Included In Following Program:											
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:											
g. Remaining Deficiency:											
h. Grand Total:											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:											4,850
b. Water pollution:											4,000
c. Occupational safety and health:											0
d. Other Environmental:											0

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION CAPE CANAVERAL AIR FORCE STATION, FLORIDA			4. PROJECT TITLE SLFI - BACKUP POWER			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 3.51.82	6. CATEGORY CODE 811-145	7. PROJECT NUMBER DBEH953008	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 2,500			
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
SLFI-BACKUP POWER		LS			2,055	
EMERGENCY GENERATORS (4-1000 KW EACH)		EA	4	220,000	(880)	
WEATHERPROOF FACILITY		SF	5,000	85	(425)	
HIGH VOLTAGE SWITCHGEAR		LS			(750)	
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					180	
FUEL STORAGE TANK		LS			(80)	
SITEWORK		LS			(50)	
UTILITIES		LS			(50)	
SUBTOTAL					2,235	
CONTINGENCY (5%)					112	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					2,347	
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					141	
TOTAL REQUEST					2,488	
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					2,500	
10. Description of Proposed Construction: A 5,000 SF facility to match the existing architecture in the Range Operations Control Center (ROCC) complex. Four 1000 KW Class C emergency power generators, appropriate 13.2 KV switch gear, automatic transfer switch, adequate ventilation, fire protection, and supporting utilities as required.						
11. REQUIREMENT: As required. PROJECT: Provide backup power to the Range Operations Control Center (ROCC). (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: This is a Space Launch Facilities Infrastructure (SLFI) requirement. A reliable source of backup power to the Range Operations Control Center (ROCC) is required during critical phases of launch operations in the event that commercial power is interrupted for time periods which exceed the capability of the uninterruptible power supply (UPS) system. The ROCC monitors and manages trajectories, air traffic, communications, pre-launch check-out, and command-destruct decision making. CURRENT SITUATION: There is currently insufficient backup power for full operation of the Range Operations Control Center during commercial power outages. The current backup generator provides only 130 KW, while 4,430 KW is required to power all radar, communications and control equipment. IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: In the event of a commercial power outage, critical testing and other pre-launch related operations must be aborted and rescheduled. Command destruct capability will be lost if power goes out during a launch. An out-of-control missile could impact on populated areas. ADDITIONAL: There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". All known						

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION CAPE CANAVERAL AIR FORCE STATION, FLORIDA		
4. PROJECT TITLE SLFI - BACKUP POWER	5. PROJECT NUMBER DBEH953008	
<p>alternative options were considered during the development of this project. No other option could meet the mission requirements; therefore, no economic analysis was needed or performed.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																																													
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION CAPE CANAVERAL AIR FORCE STATION, FLORIDA																																															
4. PROJECT TITLE SLFI - BACKUP POWER	5. PROJECT NUMBER DBEH953008																																														
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td colspan="3">(1) Status:</td> </tr> <tr> <td> (a) Date Design Started</td> <td></td> <td>92 SEP 23</td> </tr> <tr> <td> (b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td></td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td> (c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td></td> <td>92 OCT 14</td> </tr> <tr> <td> (d) Date Design Complete</td> <td></td> <td>93 AUG 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(2) Basis:</td> </tr> <tr> <td> (a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td></td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td> (b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td></td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</td> </tr> <tr> <td> (a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td></td> <td>150</td> </tr> <tr> <td> (b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td></td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td> (c) Total</td> <td></td> <td>225</td> </tr> <tr> <td> (d) Contract</td> <td></td> <td>190</td> </tr> <tr> <td> (e) In-house</td> <td></td> <td>35</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(4) Construction Start</td> <td></td> <td>93 DEC</td> </tr> </table> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(1) Status:			(a) Date Design Started		92 SEP 23	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%	(c) Date 35% Designed		92 OCT 14	(d) Date Design Complete		93 AUG 01	(2) Basis:			(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A	(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)			(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		150	(b) All Other Design Costs		75	(c) Total		225	(d) Contract		190	(e) In-house		35	(4) Construction Start		93 DEC
(1) Status:																																															
(a) Date Design Started		92 SEP 23																																													
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%																																													
(c) Date 35% Designed		92 OCT 14																																													
(d) Date Design Complete		93 AUG 01																																													
(2) Basis:																																															
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO																																													
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A																																													
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)																																															
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		150																																													
(b) All Other Design Costs		75																																													
(c) Total		225																																													
(d) Contract		190																																													
(e) In-house		35																																													
(4) Construction Start		93 DEC																																													

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)		2. DATE	
AIR FORCE					
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION CAPE CANAVERAL AIR FORCE STATION, FLORIDA			4. PROJECT TITLE SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT	6. CATEGORY CODE	7. PROJECT NUMBER	8. PROJECT COST(\$000)		
3.58.56	831-165	DBEH943005	11,900		
9. COST ESTIMATES					
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT		KG	800	6,290	5,032
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					5,655
UTILITIES		LS			(145)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(120)
DEMOLITION		LS			(295)
WW COLLECTION SYSTEM		LS			(4,200)
EFFLUENT DISPOSAL		LS			(740)
START-UP, TRAINING, O&M MANUALS		LS			(155)
SUBTOTAL					10,687
CONTINGENCY (5%)					534
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					11,221
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					673
TOTAL REQUEST					11,894
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					11,900
10. Description of Proposed Construction: A centralized wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) and collection system for all service areas of CAPE CANAVERAL AFS (CCAFS). In addition, provide new lift stations, equalization basins, sewer mains, piping, pumps, valves, and all equipment necessary for a complete system. Demolition of existing inadequate plants.					
11. REQUIREMENT: 800 KG ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 709 KG					
<u>PROJECT:</u> Construct an 800,000 gallon per day wastewater treatment and collection system for processing sewage from the launch and service areas. (Current Mission)					
<u>REQUIREMENT:</u> This is a Level II environmental compliance requirement. An 800,000 gallon per day (GPD) sewage treatment plant is required to consolidate waste streams, reduce operation and maintenance costs, improve treatment efficiency, and improve the ability to monitor and comply with the state of Florida maximum contaminant levels for wastewater discharges. A modern, upgradable plant is needed to replace numerous small wastewater treatment and disposal systems which have outlived their 20 year design lives and are not adaptable to meet more stringent effluent standards. A collection system is needed to connect facilities to new central plants. A surface disposal system is needed to comply with state regulations prohibiting discharge of treated effluent into the Indian River lagoon system.					
<u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> The existing wastewater management systems at CCAFS are comprised of 15 miles of gravity sewer and force main wastewater collection systems, 17 lift stations, 15 small WWTPs, 1 large WWTP, and 110 septic tanks. The average age of the WWTPs is 28 years and many of the manufacturers of the original systems are no longer in business to					

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION CAPE CANAVERAL AIR FORCE STATION, FLORIDA		
4. PROJECT TITLE SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT	5. PROJECT NUMBER DBEH943005	
<p>supply replacement parts and equipment. The condition of these aged plants varies from fair condition to corroded, and they are in poor operating condition. Operational problems experienced with these plants include excessive corrosion, low percolation rates (resulting in noncompliance runoff), and uncontrolled cooling tower discharges. Transient populations (during launches) overload plant capacities to process wastewater, and discharge volumes exceed the ability of the percolation ponds to absorb the processed wastewater.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Operation of the existing systems will continue to tax CCAFS maintenance resources. In the likely event that effluent standards are made more stringent, these systems cannot be effectively upgraded to comply. Argonne Labs found conditions which could lead to discharges that may result in a Notice of Violation (NOV). In turn, this could result in fines and legal actions. Even under current requirements, continued mechanical wear and corrosion of equipment will inevitably lead to system failure, necessitating expensive repairs or replacement of the numerous individual systems. Continued current operations will result in overflow conditions and untreated releases at some time in the future.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements". An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of new construction, revitalization, leasing and status quo operation. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, new construction was found to be the most cost efficient over the life of the project.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION CAPE CANAVERAL AIR FORCE STATION, FLORIDA																								
4. PROJECT TITLE SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT	5. PROJECT NUMBER DBEH943005																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>91 OCT 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 AUG 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 SEP 16</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>730</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>178</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>908</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>820</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>88</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	91 OCT 01	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 AUG 01	(d) Date Design Complete	93 SEP 16	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	730	(b) All Other Design Costs	178	(c) Total	908	(d) Contract	820	(e) In-house	88
(a) Date Design Started	91 OCT 01																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 AUG 01																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 SEP 16																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	730																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	178																							
(c) Total	908																							
(d) Contract	820																							
(e) In-house	88																							

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)		2. DATE	
AIR FORCE					
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION CAPE CANAVERAL AIR FORCE STATION, FLORIDA			4. PROJECT TITLE SLFI - UPGRADE WATER SUPPLY MAINS		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT	6. CATEGORY CODE	7. PROJECT NUMBER	8. PROJECT COST(\$000)		
3.51.82	842-245	DBEH933002	1,200		
9. COST ESTIMATES					
ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
SLFI-UPGRADE WATER SUPPLY MAINS	LS			852	
12 INCH LINES	LF	11,500	49	(564)	
8 INCH LINES	LF	7,000	39	(273)	
FIRE HYDRANTS	EA	5	3,000	(15)	
SUPPORTING FACILITIES				170	
ROAD CROSSINGS	LS			(20)	
CONNECTIONS	LS			(20)	
VALVES, VALVE BOXES	LS			(80)	
SITE WORK	LS			(50)	
SUBTOTAL				1,022	
CONTINGENCY (10%)				102	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST				1,124	
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)				67	
TOTAL REQUEST				1,191	
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)				1,200	
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Upgrade 4" and 6" water lines to 12" lines, replace deteriorated 8" line with same and install two fire hydrants. Install 8" lines and fire hydrants on aircraft parking apron. Install isolation and check valves, and pressure regulators as required. Restore property affected by construction.					
11. REQUIREMENT: 18,500 LF ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 13,500 LF PROJECT: Replace undersized and deteriorated water mains and install fire hydrants at deficient locations. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: This is a Space Launch Facilities Infrastructure (SLFI) requirement. The survey identified four areas with deficient water supply for fire protection: the Titan IV Integration, Transfer, and Launch (ITL) facility; the skidstrip aircraft ramp; the small payload processing facility; and the Mission Control radar facilities. Adequate fire protection is required to protect mission critical equipment and to comply with provisions of AFM 88-10 pertaining to aircraft ramps, which directs that hydrants are to be spaced no more than 300 feet apart, and all areas of the aircraft ramp are to be within 500 feet of a hydrant. CURRENT SITUATION: The Titan IV ITL area is fed by a ten inch and supplemental six inch water line. In the event of interruption to the ten inch line, the six inch line alone cannot provide an adequate supply of water for fire protection. Areas of the aircraft ramp are in violation of AFM 88-10. In the event of a fire, inadequate fire protection causes aircraft and contents worth millions to be exposed to loss. The small DoD payload processing facility and Mission Control radar facilities are not assured adequate fire suppression from even the single primary water supply due to deteriorated, undersized lines. A fire at one of these facilities could damage or destroy payloads being prepared for launch. In					

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION CAPE CANAVERAL AIR FORCE STATION, FLORIDA		
4. PROJECT TITLE SLFI - UPGRADE WATER SUPPLY MAINS	5. PROJECT NUMBER DBEH933002	
<p>addition to the economic loss, delays in placing payloads into orbit would also impact the mission.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Fire protection capabilities will be restricted. In the event of a fire, increased risk to personnel and damage to or loss of real property will result.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide" or AFM 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements".</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION CAPE CANAVERAL AIR FORCE STATION, FLORIDA																								
4. PROJECT TITLE SLFI - UPGRADE WATER SUPPLY MAINS	5. PROJECT NUMBER DBEH933002																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 SEP 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 OCT 14</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 AUG 01</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>62</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>112</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>87</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>25</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start</p> <p>93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 SEP 01	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 OCT 14	(d) Date Design Complete	93 AUG 01	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	62	(b) All Other Design Costs	50	(c) Total	112	(d) Contract	87	(e) In-house	25
(a) Date Design Started	92 SEP 01																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 OCT 14																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 AUG 01																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	62																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	50																							
(c) Total	112																							
(d) Contract	87																							
(e) In-house	25																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE			
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION CAPE CANAVERAL AIR FORCE STATION, FLORIDA				4. PROJECT TITLE SLFI - UPGRADE FIRE SYSTEM				
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 3.51.82		6. CATEGORY CODE 880-233	7. PROJECT NUMBER DBEH943006		8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 2,400			
9. COST ESTIMATES								
ITEM					U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
SLFI - UPGRADE FIRE SYSTEM					LS			1,900
AUTOMATIC SPRINKLER SYSTEM					SF	200,000	8	(1,600)
AUTO FIRE DETECTION SYSTEM					SF	150,000	2	(300)
SUPPORTING FACILITIES								150
DEMOLITION					LS			(150)
SUBTOTAL								2,050
CONTINGENCY (10%)								205
TOTAL CONTRACT COST								2,255
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)								135
TOTAL REQUEST								2,390
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)								2,400
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Install a single integrated detection system with electronic control panels and communications links tied to the base alarm network. Install sprinkler fire protection systems. Includes demolition of portions of existing walls, floors, and ceilings to allow installation of water piping and sensor systems.								
11. REQUIREMENT: As required. <u>PROJECT:</u> Install fire detection and sprinkler systems in the Titan Launch Operations Control Center (LOCC) and the Vertical Integration Building (VIB). (Current Mission) <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> This is a Space Launch Facilities Infrastructure (SLFI) requirement. Fully operational fire detection and suppression systems are required to protect computer and electronic control rooms, rocket assembly, and shuttle payload assembly processes. These facilities, critical to both the Space Transportation System (STS) and Titan programs, come under the classification of facilities required by AFR 88-15 to have automated sprinkler and/or fire detection systems. <u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> In some facilities no automatic sprinkler systems were installed, and in some facilities the existing systems have been disabled. Existing systems are piecemeal halon systems and should be replaced with non-ozone-depleting systems. Personnel are at risk in areas which do not have operational automatic sprinkler systems. Also, some facilities have no alarm systems, and most of those which do have them are not connected to the base alarm system. Damage to facilities and contents would be severe due to delayed response time, and even more damage would be incurred if the facilities are not occupied at the time of a fire. <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> A fire in one of these facilities will significantly increase the risk of equipment or facility damage. A fire								

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION CAPE CANAVERAL AIR FORCE STATION, FLORIDA		
4. PROJECT TITLE SLFI - UPGRADE FIRE SYSTEM	5. PROJECT NUMBER DBEH943006	
<p>in the facility resulting in major loss or damage to the facility will cause operations to cease for both the STS and Titan programs.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". All known alternative options were considered during the development of this project. No other option could meet the mission requirements; therefore, no economic analysis was needed or performed.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION CAPE CANAVERAL AIR FORCE STATION, FLORIDA																								
4. PROJECT TITLE SLFI - UPGRADE FIRE SYSTEM	5. PROJECT NUMBER DBEH943006																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="371 619 1428 745"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 SEP 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 OCT 14</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 AUG 01</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="371 808 1346 871"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="371 934 1428 1102"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>86</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>72</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>158</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>122</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>36</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 SEP 01	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 OCT 14	(d) Date Design Complete	93 AUG 01	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	86	(b) All Other Design Costs	72	(c) Total	158	(d) Contract	122	(e) In-house	36
(a) Date Design Started	92 SEP 01																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 OCT 14																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 AUG 01																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	86																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	72																							
(c) Total	158																							
(d) Contract	122																							
(e) In-house	36																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)						2. DATE			
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION EGLIN AIR FORCE BASE, FLORIDA				4. COMMAND AIR FORCE MATERIEL COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX 0.83				
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			TOTAL
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	
a. As of 30 SEP 92		1516	6541	3854							11,911
b. End FY 1998		1529	6641	4106							12,276
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (456,873)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)										468,282	
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:										24,110	
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:										69,050	
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)										0	
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:										52,500	
g. Remaining Deficiency:										0	
h. Grand Total:										613,942	
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE			SCOPE		COST (\$000)		DESIGN STATUS		
<u>CODE</u>									<u>START</u>		<u>CMPL</u>
121-122		UPGRADE HYDRANT FUELING SYSTEM			18,000 LF		4,550		SEP 92		SEP 93
125-554		REPLACE POL PIPELINE			25,000 LF		3,300		OCT 92		OCT 93
211-183		AIRCRAFT ENGINE TEST FACILITY			2 EA		1,600		JUL 92		SEP 93
214-425		VEHICLE MAINTENANCE/WAREHOUSE FACILITIES			35,300 SF		2,600		JUL 92		JUN 93
310-926		RENOVATE CLIMATIC TEST CHAMBER PHASE II			LS		57,000		JUL 91		JUN 93
							TOTAL:		69,050		
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995) NONE											
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
141-753		COMBINED OPERATIONS/ MAINT FACILITIES			23,100 SF		5,600				
141-782		AIR FREIGHT/PASSENGER TERMINAL			11,900 SF		1,600				
315-237		ADD/ALTER AIRBORNE TEST FAC			68,900 SF		8,700				
851-147		REROUTE EGLIN BOULEVARD			LS		3,000				
890-000		UPGRADE STORM WATER CONTROL MEASURES			LS		1,200				
10. Mission or Major Functions: Air Force Development Test Center (primary aircraft include AT-38, F-15, F-16, F-111, RF-4, T-38, NC-130, and UH-1) and a test wing; Air Combat Command fighter wing with three F-15 squadrons and USAF Air Warfare Center (F-15 and F-16 aircraft); an Air Force Special Operations Command special operations squadron (HC-130 aircraft); and an Air Mobility Command airlift detachment (C-21 aircraft). Major tenants include US Navy's Explosive Ordnance Disposal School and a Federal Bureau of Prisons medium security facility.											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:										6,000	
b. Water pollution:										1,200	
c. Occupational safety and health:										1,300	
d. Other Environmental:										3,400	

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)		2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION EGLIN AIR FORCE BASE, FLORIDA			4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE HYDRANT FUELING SYSTEM		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 7.28.06	6. CATEGORY CODE 121-122	7. PROJECT NUMBER FTFA913013	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 4,550		

9. COST ESTIMATES				
ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
UPGRADE HYDRANT FUELING SYSTEM	LS			2,772
SUPPORTING FACILITIES				1,315
UTILITIES	LS			(445)
SITE IMPROVEMENT	LS			(150)
PAVEMENTS	LS			(180)
FUEL STORAGE TANK	BL	10,000	54	(540)
SUBTOTAL				4,087
CONTINGENCY (5%)				204
TOTAL CONTRACT COST				4,291
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)				257
TOTAL REQUEST				4,548
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)				4,550

10. Description of Proposed Construction: Install 18,200 LF of underground pipelines, with a 10,000 BBL fuel storage tank, a hydrant fueling system, fill stands and pumps, including utilities and other necessary support.

11. REQUIREMENT: As required.
PROJECT: Upgrade a hydrant fueling system. (Current Mission)
REQUIREMENT: Improve operational/wartime aircraft refueling capability. The ability to refill refueling vehicles on the flightline is required for refueling fighter aircraft. A hydrant refueling system is required to refuel large frame aircraft, i.e. KC-10, KC-135, C-5, C-141, on the parking apron. These aircraft pass through Eglin Air Force Base daily in support of numerous and various types of test projects performed at this base. This project is required to prevent refueling delays on both essential test mission aircraft and other transient aircraft.
CURRENT SITUATION: Lack of apron refueling facilities force a manpower intensive operation that significantly reduces the effectiveness of the base's fuel delivery operations. In 1990, the base averaged 230 large frame aircraft servicings monthly, with a high of 570 servicings in March 1990. This constitutes an average of 10 percent of the truck workload with a high of 18 percent in March 1990. All large-frame aircraft are refueled using trucks, which takes about three hours per aircraft including time for travel between the flightline and the main base bulk fuel storage area. This method of operation requires an average of 30 one and one-half mile trips per day through the most congested area of the base. These trips result in approximately 23 hours of lost productivity daily and leads to extensive delays in fueling of both assigned and transient aircraft. Open road operation contributes to excessive vehicle

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION EGLIN AIR FORCE BASE, FLORIDA		
4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE HYDRANT FUELING SYSTEM	5. PROJECT NUMBER FTFA913013	
<p>downtime due to mechanical breakdowns and increases the potential for accidents.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Slow, manpower intensive operations will continue, with resultant wasted manpower and unacceptable delays to wing missions and base support of contingency operations.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of new construction, revitalization, leasing and status quo operation. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, upgrade of the existing system was found to be the most cost efficient over the life of the project. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements".</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION EGLIN AIR FORCE BASE, FLORIDA																								
4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE HYDRANT FUELING SYSTEM	5. PROJECT NUMBER FTFA913013																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="330 609 1404 756"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 SEP 20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 DEC 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 SEP 30</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="330 798 1404 882"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="330 924 1404 1102"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>198</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>314</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>512</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>512</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 SEP 20	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 DEC 01	(d) Date Design Complete	93 SEP 30	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	198	(b) All Other Design Costs	314	(c) Total	512	(d) Contract		(e) In-house	512
(a) Date Design Started	92 SEP 20																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 DEC 01																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 SEP 30																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	198																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	314																							
(c) Total	512																							
(d) Contract																								
(e) In-house	512																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION EGLIN AIR FORCE BASE, FLORIDA			4. PROJECT TITLE REPLACE POL PIPELINE			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 7.80.56	6. CATEGORY CODE 125-554	7. PROJECT NUMBER FTFA953019	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 3,300			
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
AIRCRAFT POL PIPELINE		LF	25,000	87	2,175	
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					805	
UTILITIES		LS			(95)	
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(60)	
REMOVE EXISTING PIPELINE		LF	25,000	6	(150)	
CATHODIC PROTECTION SYSTEM		LF	25,000	12	(300)	
LEAK DETECTION SYSTEM		LF	25,000	8	(200)	
SUBTOTAL					2,980	
CONTINGENCY (5%)					149	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					3,129	
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					188	
TOTAL REQUEST					3,317	
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					3,300	
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Install 25,000 feet of 8-inch POL pipeline, with cathodic protection, leak detection and dewatering systems, and necessary support. Remove existing pipeline.						
11. REQUIREMENT: As required. PROJECT: Replace a POL pipeline. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: This is a Level II environmental compliance project. An adequate POL pipeline is required to replace the existing deteriorated line that supplies JP-4 fuel from the main base area to a remote location used by the 33rd Fighter Wing. The JP-4 fuel is required for daily refueling of F-15 aircraft assigned to the 33rd Fighter Wing. Florida State Regulation 17.761.510 requires replacement of underground POL systems that were installed prior to 1970, which includes this pipeline. CURRENT SITUATION: The existing aircraft fuel line was installed in 1957 and was required by Florida law to have been replaced by 1989. It is an eight-inch steel line wrapped in asphalt, but has no operating corrosion control or leak detection system. The 33rd Fighter Wing has daily flights from this field and relies on the pipeline to replenish its operating storage tanks. A major break in the pipeline in 1990 resulted in an expenditure of \$64,000 for initial cleanup, and will require additional cleanup expenditures under the Installation Restoration Program. IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: Damage to the environment through fuel contamination of the soils and ground water will worsen. Continued use of this pipeline will potentially jeopardize the health of local inhabitants and interfere with fighter wing operations. The base will remain out of compliance with Florida law and will be subject to fines. ADDITIONAL: There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of						

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION EGLIN AIR FORCE BASE, FLORIDA		
4. PROJECT TITLE REPLACE POL PIPELINE	5. PROJECT NUMBER FTFA953019	
<p>Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements". An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of construction, revitalization, leasing and status quo operation. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, replacement construction was found to be the most cost efficient over the life of the project.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION EGLIN AIR FORCE BASE, FLORIDA																								
4. PROJECT TITLE REPLACE POL PIPELINE	5. PROJECT NUMBER FTFA953019																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 OCT 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 DEC 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 OCT 15</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>204</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>102</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>306</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>306</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 OCT 01	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 DEC 15	(d) Date Design Complete	93 OCT 15	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	204	(b) All Other Design Costs	102	(c) Total	306	(d) Contract		(e) In-house	306
(a) Date Design Started	92 OCT 01																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 DEC 15																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 OCT 15																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	204																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	102																							
(c) Total	306																							
(d) Contract																								
(e) In-house	306																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION EGLIN AIR FORCE BASE, FLORIDA		4. PROJECT TITLE AIRCRAFT ENGINE TEST FACILITY		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 7.28.06	6. CATEGORY CODE 211-183	7. PROJECT NUMBER FTFA943027	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 1,600	
9. COST ESTIMATES				
ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
AIRCRAFT ENGINE TEST FACILITY	EA	2	500,000	1,000
SUPPORTING FACILITIES				440
UTILITIES	LS			(40)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS	LS			(50)
PAVEMENTS	SY	3,700	55	(205)
MAINTENANCE SUPPORT FACILITY	SF	2,400	60	(145)
SUBTOTAL				1,440
CONTINGENCY (5%)				72
TOTAL CONTRACT COST				1,512
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)				91
TOTAL REQUEST				1,603
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)				1,600
EQUIPMENT FROM OTHER APPROPRIATIONS (NON-ADD)				(6,100)
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Reinforced concrete footings, floor slab, deflector walls and access pavements; utilities connections: and a pre-engineered maintenance support facility; includes site work and necessary support. Air Conditioning: 5 Tons.				
11. REQUIREMENT: 2 EA ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 2 EA PROJECT: Provide facility support for installation of two T-9 engine test cells. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: An aircraft engine test facility is required for testing jet engines used on specially modified aircraft which fly test and evaluation missions associated with the development of aircraft armaments, electronic combat systems, target acquisition and weapon delivery systems. The capability to perform operational runs, tests, and troubleshooting of 158 aircraft jet engines ranging from 2,800 to 30,000 pounds of thrust is required. This is in direct support of T-38, F-15, and F-16 fighter aircraft assigned to the 3246th Test Wing. These engines must be run in an enclosed facility to alleviate noise pollution as required by federal and state laws and to protect the on-base and off-base populace from the adverse effects of loud noises. CURRENT SITUATION: The existing test cells were constructed in the late 1960s and were designed to test engines in use during that era. The cells are badly deteriorated due to the combined effects of heat, water pressure, and vibration created during run-up of the more powerful modern engines. Structural deterioration, consisting of major structural cracks, severe spalling of concrete, and a defective rear thrust beam support, have made it necessary to reduce the maximum thrust limits for engine tests in both test cells. Over 75 major structural cracks, many of which				

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION EGLIN AIR FORCE BASE, FLORIDA		
4. PROJECT TITLE AIRCRAFT ENGINE TEST FACILITY	5. PROJECT NUMBER FTFA943027	
<p>penetrate the 18 inch walls, have been identified in the exhaust systems of each cell. The extent of vibration damage to the rear thrust beam support in one cell made it necessary to cut back this support. In doing so, the thrust capacity for that cell was reduced from 35,000 pounds to 25,000 pounds for fear of catastrophic failure of this beam. Only our lowest rated engines can now run in this test cell. As tests of newer, more powerful engines continue, the test cells will continue to deteriorate and complete structural failure is likely.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> The capability to operate and test aircraft engines on base could be completely lost due to total failure of both test cells. Test flights will be delayed, thereby impairing the timely development and production of superior weapon systems needed by the Air Force.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements".</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																																		
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION EGLIN AIR FORCE BASE, FLORIDA																																				
4. PROJECT TITLE AIRCRAFT ENGINE TEST FACILITY	5. PROJECT NUMBER FTFA943027																																			
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="330 617 1395 766"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 JUL 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 SEP 10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 SEP 15</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="330 808 1395 893"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="330 936 1395 1117"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>96</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>32</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>128</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>128</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations:</p> <table data-bbox="165 1383 1395 1596"> <thead> <tr> <th>EQUIPMENT NOMENCLATURE</th> <th>PROCURING APPROPRIATION</th> <th>FISCAL YEAR APPROPRIATED OR REQUESTED</th> <th>COST (\$000)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A/37T-9 TEST CELLS (2 EACH)</td> <td>3010</td> <td>94</td> <td>5100</td> </tr> <tr> <td>CONTROL CABS AND EQUIPMENT</td> <td>3010</td> <td>94</td> <td>1000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			(a) Date Design Started	92 JUL 15	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 SEP 10	(d) Date Design Complete	93 SEP 15	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	96	(b) All Other Design Costs	32	(c) Total	128	(d) Contract		(e) In-house	128	EQUIPMENT NOMENCLATURE	PROCURING APPROPRIATION	FISCAL YEAR APPROPRIATED OR REQUESTED	COST (\$000)	A/37T-9 TEST CELLS (2 EACH)	3010	94	5100	CONTROL CABS AND EQUIPMENT	3010	94	1000
(a) Date Design Started	92 JUL 15																																			
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																																			
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 SEP 10																																			
(d) Date Design Complete	93 SEP 15																																			
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																																			
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																																			
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	96																																			
(b) All Other Design Costs	32																																			
(c) Total	128																																			
(d) Contract																																				
(e) In-house	128																																			
EQUIPMENT NOMENCLATURE	PROCURING APPROPRIATION	FISCAL YEAR APPROPRIATED OR REQUESTED	COST (\$000)																																	
A/37T-9 TEST CELLS (2 EACH)	3010	94	5100																																	
CONTROL CABS AND EQUIPMENT	3010	94	1000																																	

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)				2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION EGLIN AIR FORCE BASE, FLORIDA			4. PROJECT TITLE VEHICLE MAINTENANCE/WAREHOUSE FACILITIES				
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 2.75.96C		6. CATEGORY CODE 214-425	7. PROJECT NUMBER FTFA933014		8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 2,600		
9. COST ESTIMATES							
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)		
VEHICLE MAINTENANCE/WAREHOUSE FACILITIES		SF	21,500		1,583		
VEHICLE MAINTENANCE FACILITY		SF	15,000	87	(1,305)		
WAREHOUSE FACILITY		SF	5,000	45	(225)		
HAZARDOUS WASTE STORAGE		SF	1,500	35	(53)		
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					750		
UTILITIES		LS			(260)		
PAVEMENTS		LS			(210)		
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(210)		
VEHICLE WASHRACK		SF	2,500	28	(70)		
SUBTOTAL					2,333		
CONTINGENCY (5%)					117		
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					2,450		
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					147		
TOTAL REQUEST					2,597		
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					2,600		
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Reinforced concrete foundation and floor slab, pre-engineered metal building, metal roof system, all pavements, utilities and necessary support. Includes vehicle maintenance and warehouse facilities with vehicle washrack. Air Conditioning: 20 Tons.							
11. REQUIREMENT: 21,700 SF ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 0 PROJECT: Construct vehicle maintenance and warehouse facilities. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: Permanent facilities of adequate size and configuration are required to complete the final phase of moving the 728th Air Control Squadron (ACS) from Duke Field to Eglin AFB. Adequate facilities are required to maintain the squadron's vehicles and equipment in ready condition for world-wide deployment. This unit controls approximately 200 close air support and interception sorties per month in support of the 33rd Fighter Wing and provides radar surveillance essential to area security. CURRENT SITUATION: The 728 ACS's maintenance and warehouse functions are at Duke Field, remotely separated from command and operations functions, which are 25 miles away on the main base portion of Eglin AFB. All personnel support is provided on Eglin AFB proper, including billeting and full-time messing. The consolidation of the rest of the 728th ACS to Eglin was provided for by a FY 92 Military Construction project at Eglin. Existing maintenance and warehouse facilities at Duke Field are substandard in construction, configuration, interior and exterior finish, and geographical location. The best facility, a 33,000 square foot aircraft hanger, only offers 10,000 SF suitable to an ACS mission. Distance between facilities poses span of control problems. Unit morale							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION EGLIN AIR FORCE BASE, FLORIDA		
4. PROJECT TITLE VEHICLE MAINTENANCE/WAREHOUSE FACILITIES	5. PROJECT NUMBER FTFA933014	
<p>base exchange, and messing services. Particular hardships are imposed on young airmen without personal transportation to travel to and from dormitories and obtain meals. Required vehicle maintenance and warehouse support efforts are severely degraded due to the split locations. Excess maintenance, repair and utility dollars are being expended on substandard facilities.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> There will be an adverse impact on the mission readiness of the 728th ACS and their critical support of the 33rd Fighter Wing of Eglin AFB. Extreme geographical separation of the unit's maintenance and warehouse facilities from their command and operations facilities will cause delays in equipment maintenance. Personal hardships associated with having to work at a location separated from all personnel, training and quality of life support facilities will continue to degrade morale. Inadequate space in substandard facilities will continue to degrade the operational functions of essential vehicle maintenance.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide." However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements." An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of new construction, revitalization, leasing and status quo operation. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, new construction was found to be the most cost efficient over the life of the project.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION EGLIN AIR FORCE BASE, FLORIDA																								
4. PROJECT TITLE VEHICLE MAINTENANCE/WAREHOUSE FACILITIES	5. PROJECT NUMBER FTFA933014																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 JUL 06</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 SEP 30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 JUN 21</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>120</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>90</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>210</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>24</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>186</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 JUL 06	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 SEP 30	(d) Date Design Complete	93 JUN 21	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	120	(b) All Other Design Costs	90	(c) Total	210	(d) Contract	24	(e) In-house	186
(a) Date Design Started	92 JUL 06																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 SEP 30																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 JUN 21																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	120																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	90																							
(c) Total	210																							
(d) Contract	24																							
(e) In-house	186																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)		2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION EGLIN AIR FORCE BASE, FLORIDA			4. PROJECT TITLE RENOVATE CLIMATIC TEST CHAMBER PHASE II		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 6.47.55	6. CATEGORY CODE 310-926	7. PROJECT NUMBER FTFA933026	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 57,000		

9. COST ESTIMATES				
ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
RENOVATE CLIMATIC TEST CHAMBER, PHASE II	SF	136,500	310	42,315
SUPPORTING FACILITIES				11,025
UTILITIES	LS			(5,325)
MONITORING AND CONTROL SYSTEM	LS			(1,945)
FIRE PROTECTION	LS			(2,475)
MISCELLANEOUS SUPPORT	LS			(795)
PAVEMENTS	LS			(220)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS	LS			(265)
SUBTOTAL				53,340
CONTINGENCY (10%)				5,334
TOTAL CONTRACT COST				58,674
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)				3,520
TOTAL REQUEST				62,194
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)				62,000
LESS FY 93 AUTHORIZATION/APPROPRIATION				-5,000
FY 94 AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATION REQUEST				57,000
FY 94 APPROPRIATION REQUEST				57,000

10. Description of Proposed Construction: Renovate equipment and main test chambers including replacement of wall, ceiling and floor systems, access doors, electrical and monorail lift systems and provide AFFF fire protection system, elevators, etc; renovate engineering and work areas; provide new air make-up unit and monitoring and control system. Upgrade electric service and provide necessary support.
Air Conditioning: 1000 Tons.

11. REQUIREMENT: 140,800 LS ADEQUATE: 3,500 LS SUBSTANDARD: 136,500 LS
PROJECT: Renovate a climatic test chamber, phase 2 of 2. (Current Mission)
REQUIREMENT: A facility is required for the complete environmental testing of aircraft, equipment and weapon systems to simulate the extreme weather conditions that may be encountered anywhere on earth. Performance, durability, reliability and operating parameters must be evaluated under all weather conditions, including rain, wind, fog, snow, ice and extreme heat or cold. The facility must have a make-up air system capable of maintaining temperature and humidity needed for climatic testing of Army, Navy and Air Force weapon systems and equipment. This is the final phase of a two-phased program to upgrade the climatic test hangar.
CURRENT SITUATION: This facility was built over forty years ago during World War II and is currently the only facility in existence that performs the full scale environmental testing of the largest aircraft in the Air Force inventory. The extreme conditions created in the chamber are causing rapid and severe deterioration of the ceiling, wall, floor and duct systems. Deterioration of the vapor barrier causes severe icing conditions within the chamber, resulting in considerable hazards to

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION EGLIN AIR FORCE BASE, FLORIDA		
4. PROJECT TITLE RENOVATE CLIMATIC TEST CHAMBER PHASE II	5. PROJECT NUMBER FTFA933026	

personnel and equipment. The electrical system has deteriorated to the point of being unsafe and no longer meets minimum code requirements. Band-aid repairs to this facility are no longer effective.

IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: Climatic testing will have to be curtailed at this facility within a few years, making the reliability of much of the new equipment being developed for the US armed forces suspect.

ADDITIONAL: An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of new construction, revitalization, and status quo operation. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, revitalization was found to be the most cost efficient over the life of the project. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide", or in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements".

AUTHORIZATION AND APPROPRIATION SUMMARY

	APPROVED BY CONGRESS <u>FY 93</u>	REQUESTED <u>FY 94</u>
AUTHORIZATION OF THE PROJECT	64.0M	0
AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATION	5.0M	57.0M
APPROPRIATION	5.0M	57.0M

1. COMPONENT	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
AIR FORCE		
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION		
EGLIN AIR FORCE BASE, FLORIDA		
4. PROJECT TITLE	5. PROJECT NUMBER	
RENOVATE CLIMATIC TEST CHAMBER PHASE II	FTFA933026	
12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:		
a. Estimated Design Data:		
(1) Status:		
(a) Date Design Started		91 JUL 26
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		80%
(c) Date 35% Designed		91 DEC 15
(d) Date Design Complete		93 JUN 04
(2) Basis:		
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e):		
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		(\$000) 3540
(b) All Other Design Costs		2210
(c) Total		5750
(d) Contract		5590
(e) In-house		160
(4) Construction Start		
		94 MAR
b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)						2. DATE			
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION EGLIN AUXILIARY FIELD NO 9, FLORIDA					4. COMMAND COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX 0.83			
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	TOTAL
a. As of 30 SEP 92		924	5039	472	28	77		589	491	73	7,693
b. End FY 1998		947	5247	464	28	81		589	491	73	7,920
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (6,634)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)										112,839	
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:										0	
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:										7,829	
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)										2,300	
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:										21,350	
g. Remaining Deficiency:										0	
h. Grand Total:										144,318	
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE			SCOPE		COST (\$000)		DESIGN STATUS		
CODE									START		CMPLE
721-312		ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES			276 PN		4,479		JUL 92		JUL 93
832-266		UPGRADE SANITARY SEWER SYSTEM			50,000 LF		1,750		JUN 92		AUG 93
871-183		UPGRADE STORM SEWAGE SYSTEM			80,000 LF		1,600		JUN 92		JUG 93
TOTAL:							7,829				
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995)											
880-212		INSTALL FIRE SUPPRESSION SYSTEM			53,200 SF		2,300				
TOTAL:							2,300				
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
130-835		ADD TO SECURITY POLICE OPERATIONS			2,500 SF		540				
171-476		COMBAT ARMS TNG MAINTENANCE			16,000 SF		1,900				
411-135		JET FUEL STORAGE			20,000 BL		1,250				
721-312		ALTER UNACCOMPANIED ENLISTED HSG			276 PN		9,000				
890-181		ALTER UTILITY LINE DUCTS			LS		560				
10. Mission or Major Functions: Headquarters Special Operations Command; a special operations wing with five squadrons (AC-130 and MC-130 aircraft, and MH-53 and MH-60 helicopters); Air Force Special Operations School; Special Missions Operational Test and Evaluation Center; a special tactics group; and Air Combat Command air control and training groups.											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:										0	
b. Water pollution:										0	
c. Occupational safety and health:										0	
d. Other Environmental:										0	

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)		2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION EGLIN AUXILIARY FIELD NO 9, FLORIDA			4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 4.18.96	6. CATEGORY CODE 721-312	7. PROJECT NUMBER FTEV913001	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 4,479		
9. COST ESTIMATES					
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES (276 PN)		SF	58,000		3,020
ALTERATION		SF	50,500	50	(2,525)
ADDITION (BALCONIES)		SF	7,500	66	(495)
SUPPORTING FACILITIES			1		835
UTILITIES		LS			(240)
PAVEMENTS		LS			(125)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(100)
ASBESTOS REMOVAL		LS			(100)
COMMUNICATIONS SUPPORT		LS			(270)
SUBTOTAL					3,855
CONTINGENCY (10%)					386
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					4,241
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (5.5%)					233
TOTAL REQUEST					4,474
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					4,479
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Addition of new balconies and exterior room entrances. Demolition of existing interior partitions. Renovation to include new room-bath-room modules, laundries, storage, lounge areas, asbestos removal, converting flat roof to sloped roof and necessary support. Air Conditioning: 140 Tons. Grade Mix: 195 E1-E4; 64 E5-E6; 17 E7-E9.					
11. REQUIREMENT: 1,864 PN ADEQUATE: 1,530 PN SUBSTANDARD: 492 PN PROJECT: Add to and alter dormitories. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: A major Air Force objective is to provide unaccompanied enlisted personnel with housing conducive to their proper rest, relaxation, and personal well-being. Properly designed and furnished quarters which provide some degree of individual privacy are essential to the successful accomplishment of the increasingly complicated and important jobs these people must perform. CURRENT SITUATION: The facilities to be upgraded were constructed in the 1950's. Inefficiencies include lack of privacy, inadequate lighting, poor insulation and sound attenuation, obsolete electrical and mechanical systems and central latrines. This project will upgrade two dorms and is the second phase of a three phase program to upgrade base dormitories. Current dorm occupancy rate at this base is 86 percent. IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: Substandard living conditions will persist and morale, productivity and career satisfaction of the enlisted force will continue to be degraded. ADDITIONAL: A life-cycle economic analysis has been performed comparing all reasonable options for accomplishing this project. The analysis indicates the renovation alternative is the most economical. This project meets the criteria scope specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190.					

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION EGLIN AUXILIARY FIELD NO 9, FLORIDA		
4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES	5. PROJECT NUMBER FTEV913001	
<p>"Facility Planning and Design Guide". Project has been considered for FY97 force structure end strength.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION EGLIN AUXILIARY FIELD NO 9, FLORIDA																								
4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES	5. PROJECT NUMBER FTEV913001																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="327 611 1395 743"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 JUL 20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 AUG 14</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 JUL 15</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="327 806 1301 869"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="327 932 1395 1094"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>162</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>268</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>430</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>271</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>159</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 JAN</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 JUL 20	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 AUG 14	(d) Date Design Complete	93 JUL 15	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	162	(b) All Other Design Costs	268	(c) Total	430	(d) Contract	271	(e) In-house	159
(a) Date Design Started	92 JUL 20																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 AUG 14																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 JUL 15																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	162																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	268																							
(c) Total	430																							
(d) Contract	271																							
(e) In-house	159																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)				2. DATE		
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION EGLIN AUXILIARY FIELD NO 9, FLORIDA				4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE SANITARY SEWAGE SYSTEM				
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 4.18.56		6. CATEGORY CODE 832-266		7. PROJECT NUMBER FTEV943021		8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 1,750		
9. COST ESTIMATES								
ITEM					U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
UPGRADE SANITARY SEWAGE SYSTEM					LF	50,000	21	1,050
SUPPORTING FACILITIES								450
SITE IMPROVEMENTS/PAVEMENTS					LS			(450)
SUBTOTAL								1,500
CONTINGENCY (10%)								150
TOTAL CONTRACT COST								1,650
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)								99
TOTAL REQUEST								1,749
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)								1,750
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Excavate and remove vitrious clay pipe and replace with PVC pipe, repair/replace manholes. Includes pavement repair and support as required.								
11. REQUIREMENT: As required. <u>PROJECT:</u> Upgrade sanitary sewage system. (Current Mission) <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> This is a Level I environmental compliance project, required to bring the existing sanitary sewage system into compliance with current state and federal environmental regulations. It will eliminate excessive infiltration/inflow to prevent hydraulic overloading in the sanitary sewage collection system. <u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> The base sanitary sewer system is antiquated and unable to meet the current environmental compliance requirements. Constant sewage line leaks, problems associated with excessive infiltration/inflow to the existing sewage treatment plant, and hydraulic overloading have resulted in Hurlburt Field exceeding operating permit limits. Even with the new sewage treatment plant in the FY90 MILCON program, hydraulic overloading will still occur and cause continuous violations of state discharge permit limits. This project corrects violations of Chapter 17-600.42, 17-600.500 and 17-600.530 of the Florida Administrative Code and Chapter 403.088 of the Florida Statutes. <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> The sanitary sewage system will continue to deteriorate, thus increasing the amount of excessive infiltration/inflow to the existing and proposed sewage treatment plant. This will expose the Air Force and DOD to fines and possible litigation. <u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There is no criteria for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2,								

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION EGLIN AUXILIARY FIELD NO 9, FLORIDA		
4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE SANITARY SEWAGE SYSTEM	5. PROJECT NUMBER FTEV943021	
<p>"Standard Facility Requirements". Project has been considered for FY97 force structure end strength.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION EGLIN AUXILIARY FIELD NO 9, FLORIDA																								
4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE SANITARY SEWAGE SYSTEM	5. PROJECT NUMBER FTEV943021																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 JUN 10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 AUG 14</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 AUG 15</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>84</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>56</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>140</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>35</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>105</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 JAN</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 JUN 10	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 AUG 14	(d) Date Design Complete	93 AUG 15	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	84	(b) All Other Design Costs	56	(c) Total	140	(d) Contract	35	(e) In-house	105
(a) Date Design Started	92 JUN 10																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 AUG 14																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 AUG 15																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	84																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	56																							
(c) Total	140																							
(d) Contract	35																							
(e) In-house	105																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION EGLIN AUXILIARY FIELD NO 9, FLORIDA			4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE STORM SEWAGE SYSTEM			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 4.18.56		6. CATEGORY CODE 871-183	7. PROJECT NUMBER FTEV943020		8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 1,600	
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
UPGRADE STORM SEWAGE SYSTEM		LF	80,000	15	1,200	
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					160	
UTILITIES RELOCATION		LS			(100)	
PAVEMENTS		LS			(60)	
SUBTOTAL					1,360	
CONTINGENCY (10%)					136	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					1,496	
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					90	
TOTAL REQUEST					1,586	
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					1,600	
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Reshape drainage ditches, regrade, install curbs, gutters and construct check dam. Includes relocation of utilities, pavement repair and support as required.						
11. REQUIREMENT: As required. <u>PROJECT:</u> Upgrade storm sewage system. (Current Mission) <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> This is a Level I environmental compliance project, required to bring the existing storm water drainage system into compliance with current state and federal environmental regulations. This project will upgrade stormwater drainage systems for compliance with State of Florida Department of Environmental Regulations standards as well as provide spill contingency check dam locations in accordance with the Clean Water Act. <u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> Existing stormwater drainage system is out of compliance with Chapter 17-25 of the Florida Administrative Code and Chapter 403 of the Florida Statutes. The deteriorated storm sewer network contributes to sewage plant overload because many of the sanitary sewers are located in low-lying areas with poor drainage. Ponding storm water promotes excessive infiltration/inflow in the sanitary system contributing to hydraulic overload to the sewage treatment plant. Letters of non-compliance have been issued by the State of Florida Department of Environmental Regulation because the storm water drainage system is out of compliance. <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> The storm water disposal system will continue to deteriorate, thus increasing the amount of excessive infiltration/inflow to the existing and proposed sewage treatment plant which is included in the FY90 MILCON program. This will expose the Air Force and DOD to fines and possible litigation. <u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of						

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION EGLIN AUXILIARY FIELD NO 9, FLORIDA		
4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE STORM SEWAGE SYSTEM	5. PROJECT NUMBER FTEV943020	
<p>Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements". Project has been considered for FY97 force structure end strength.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION EGLIN AUXILIARY FIELD NO 9, FLORIDA																								
4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE STORM SEWAGE SYSTEM	5. PROJECT NUMBER FTEV943020																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="330 609 1404 756"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 JUN 10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 AUG 14</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 AUG 15</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="330 798 1404 882"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="330 924 1404 1102"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>76</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>52</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>128</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>35</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>93</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 JAN</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 JUN 10	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 AUG 14	(d) Date Design Complete	93 AUG 15	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	76	(b) All Other Design Costs	52	(c) Total	128	(d) Contract	35	(e) In-house	93
(a) Date Design Started	92 JUN 10																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 AUG 14																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 AUG 15																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	76																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	52																							
(c) Total	128																							
(d) Contract	35																							
(e) In-house	93																							

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)						2. DATE			
AIR FORCE											
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION				4. COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX				
PATRICK AIR FORCE BASE, FLORIDA				AIR FORCE SPACE COMMAND			0.91				
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED		TOTAL	
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL		
a. As of 30 SEP 92		473	2317	1054				33	531	15	4,423
b. End FY 1998		462	1704	960				33	531	15	3,705
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (2,341)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)		148,294									
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:		7,700									
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:		3,850									
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)		2,200									
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:		39,700									
g. Remaining Deficiency:		0									
h. Grand Total:		201,744									
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE		SCOPE		COST (\$000)		DESIGN STATUS			
<u>CODE</u>								<u>START</u> <u>CMPL</u>			
211-111		ALTER MAINTENANCE HANGAR		65,155 SF		2,000		AUG 92 JUL 93			
411-135		UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS		44 EA		1,850					
				TOTAL:		3,850					
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995)											
149-962		CONTROL TOWER		5,300 SF		2,200					
				TOTAL:		2,200					
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
141-783		PASSENGER TERMINAL & BASE OPERATIONS		48,400 SF		9,800					
214-425		VEHICLE MAINTENANCE/MOTOR POOL FACILITY		42,000 SF		6,200					
219-944		BASE ENGINEERING COMPLEX		43,400 SF		4,700					
442-758		BASE SUPPLY/TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT COMPLEX		166,000 SF		12,000					
721-312		UPGRADE DORMITORIES		568 PN		3,000					
10. Mission or Major Functions: A space wing; the Air Force Technical Applications Center; two Air Mobility Command air rescue squadrons (HH-3 helicopters and HC-130 aircraft); and an Air Combat Command combat communications group. Also, the temporary beddown location for the Air Force Reserve air rescue squadron (MH-60 helicopters) from Homestead AFB, FL. Major tenants include the DOD Equal Opportunity Management Institute and a State Department aviation unit.											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:		0									
b. Water pollution:		4,000									
c. Occupational safety and health:		2,200									
d. Other Environmental:		0									

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)		2. DATE	
AIR FORCE					
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION			4. PROJECT TITLE		
PATRICK AIR FORCE BASE, FLORIDA			ALTER MAINTENANCE HANGAR		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT	6. CATEGORY CODE	7. PROJECT NUMBER	8. PROJECT COST(\$000)		
4.41.02	211-111	SXHT933095	2,000		
9. COST ESTIMATES					
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
ALTER MAINTENANCE HANGAR		SF	65,000	23	1,495
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					240
UTILITIES		LS			(165)
PAVEMENTS		LS			(50)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(25)
SUBTOTAL					1,735
CONTINGENCY (10%)					174
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					1,909
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					115
TOTAL REQUEST					2,024
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					2,000
10. Description of Proposed Construction: All electrical, mechanical and structural work necessary to alter hangar. Alter space for NDI, PMEL, avionics shops, aircraft maintenance and transient alert. Includes altering hangar door to accommodate tail section of HC-130 aircraft and necessary support.					
11. REQUIREMENT: 65,000 SF ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 65,000 SF PROJECT: Alter maintenance hangar. (New Mission) REQUIREMENT: Hangar alterations are required to reconfigure existing maintenance hangar to support the beddown of HC-130 and MH-60G aircraft which operate in support of aerospace rescue and recovery operations. Adequate space is required for Non Destructive Inspection (NDI), Precision Measurement Equipment Laboratory (PMEL), avionics shops and transient alert operations. The hangar doors must be altered to allow the HC-130 aircraft to be fully enclosed to allow safe aircraft lifting operations out of the influence of the local gusty winds. CURRENT SITUATION: The existing aircraft maintenance hangar is not properly configured to support beddown of the HC-130 and MH-60G aircraft. The facility currently supports five HH-3 aircraft. Space is provided for NDI, PMEL, avionics, fabrication shops, life support, engine shop and transient alert. Reconfiguration is required to provide hangar space for five HC-130 aircraft and six MH-60G aircraft. The HC-130 aircraft are new aircraft while the MH-60G aircraft replace the HH-3's. In order to provide the space necessary for reconfiguration, the fabrication branch, life support and engine shop operations will be relocated to an adjacent facility. This vacated space will then be reconfigured to provide space for the newly assigned HC-130 and the MH-60G aircraft. Reconfiguration of existing maintenance space and alteration of the hangar doors will provide					

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION PATRICK AIR FORCE BASE, FLORIDA		
4. PROJECT TITLE ALTER MAINTENANCE HANGAR	5. PROJECT NUMBER SXHT933095	
<p>an adequate maintenance hangar to support the beddown of the HC-130 and MH-60G aircraft.</p> <p>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: Lack of an adequate maintenance facility will decrease air rescue's ability to communicate, locate and navigate to perform their assigned mission in support of the space shuttle and other high national interest missions.</p> <p>ADDITIONAL: There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements". A preliminary analysis of reasonable options for accomplishing this project (status quo, renovation and new construction) was done. It indicates that renovation is the only option that satisfies mission beddown construction requirements. Therefore a full economic analysis was not performed. A certificate of exception has been prepared. Project has been considered for FY97 force structure end strength.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																																													
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION PATRICK AIR FORCE BASE, FLORIDA																																															
4. PROJECT TITLE ALTER MAINTENANCE HANGAR	5. PROJECT NUMBER SXHT933095																																														
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td colspan="3">(1) Status:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td></td> <td>92 AUG 28</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td></td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td></td> <td>92 OCT 12</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td></td> <td>93 JUL 14</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(2) Basis:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td></td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td></td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td></td> <td>30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td></td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td></td> <td>40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> <td>30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td></td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(4) Construction Start</td> <td></td> <td>94 JAN</td> </tr> </table> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(1) Status:			(a) Date Design Started		92 AUG 28	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%	(c) Date 35% Designed		92 OCT 12	(d) Date Design Complete		93 JUL 14	(2) Basis:			(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A	(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)			(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		30	(b) All Other Design Costs		10	(c) Total		40	(d) Contract		30	(e) In-house		10	(4) Construction Start		94 JAN
(1) Status:																																															
(a) Date Design Started		92 AUG 28																																													
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%																																													
(c) Date 35% Designed		92 OCT 12																																													
(d) Date Design Complete		93 JUL 14																																													
(2) Basis:																																															
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO																																													
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A																																													
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)																																															
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		30																																													
(b) All Other Design Costs		10																																													
(c) Total		40																																													
(d) Contract		30																																													
(e) In-house		10																																													
(4) Construction Start		94 JAN																																													

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)		2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION PATRICK AIR FORCE BASE, FLORIDA			4. PROJECT TITLE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 3.58.56	6. CATEGORY CODE 411-135	7. PROJECT NUMBER SXHT933004	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 1,850		
9. COST ESTIMATES					
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS		LS			515
REMOVE REGULATED USTS		EA	8	4,380	(35)
INSTALL REG REPLACEMENT ASTS		EA	8	15,000	(120)
UPGRADE REGULATED ASTS		EA	15	24,000	(360)
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					1,145
SITE ASSESSMENTS AND REMEDIATION		LS			(150)
BASEWIDE LEAK DETEC MONITORING SYS		LS			(995)
SUBTOTAL					1,660
CONTINGENCY (5%)					83
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					1,743
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					105
TOTAL REQUEST					1,848
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					1,850
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Provides for removal of 8 underground fuel storage tanks (USTs); installation of 8 aboveground storage tanks (ASTs); and upgrades 15 aboveground storage tanks.					
11. REQUIREMENT: As required. PROJECT: Remove and replace, or upgrade fuel storage tanks. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: This is a Level I environmental compliance requirement. Fuel storage tanks must be in compliance with State and Federal environmental regulations and Air Force policy. These include Florida Department of Environmental Regulation (FDER), Ch. 17-761 and 17-762, Federal regulations 40 CFR 280, and Air Force UST Management Strategy. Thirteen USTs to be removed are subject to the following deadlines: tank replacement, 5 ea, Dec 1995 (FDER 17-761.510(6) Table 1, installed 1978, R required); secondary containment, interstitial monitoring, double-walled piping, and overfill protection, 4 ea, Dec 1998 (FDER 17-761.510(6) Table 1, installed 1981-1984, R,C,P, & L required). ASTs to be upgraded are regulated by 17-762.600(5) and are subject to a Dec 1993 deadline for release detection for integral piping. CURRENT SITUATION: Thirteen UST systems are regulated and are subject to 1995 and 1998 FDER UST deadlines. Fifteen AST systems are regulated and subject to 1993 FDER AST regulations. IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: Compliance with Florida and federal regulations will not be achieved. Noncompliance can result in fines, closure of facilities, or possibly criminal prosecution. Tanks will continue to deteriorate, further increasing risks of leaks and spills. USTs which have been leaking will continue to release pollutants to soil and groundwater, increasing future cleanup costs.					

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION PATRICK AIR FORCE BASE, FLORIDA		
4. PROJECT TITLE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	5. PROJECT NUMBER SXHT933004	
<p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". All known alternative options were considered during the development of this project. No other option could meet the mission requirements; therefore, no economic analysis was needed or performed.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE				
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION PATRICK AIR FORCE BASE, FLORIDA						
4. PROJECT TITLE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	5. PROJECT NUMBER SXHT933004					
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Project to be accomplished by one step turn key procedures</p> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="355 678 1405 743"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Design Allowance 92</p> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO					
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A					

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)						2. DATE			
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION TYNDALL AIR FORCE BASE, FLORIDA				4. COMMAND AIR COMBAT COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX 0.86				
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	TOTAL
a. As of 30 SEP 92		789	3838	951	143	167		7	3	27	5,925
b. End FY 1998		754	3722	964	143	167		7	3	27	5,787
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (28,906)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)										225,507	
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:										9,350	
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:										2,600	
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)										2,500	
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:										11,050	
g. Remaining Deficiency:										0	
h. Grand Total:										251,007	
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY											
<u>CODE</u>	<u>PROJECT TITLE</u>				<u>SCOPE</u>	<u>COST (\$000)</u>	<u>DESIGN STATUS</u>				
							<u>START</u>	<u>CMPL</u>			
442-758	BASE SUPPLY LOGISTICS CENTER				21,400 SF	2,600	MAY 87	JUN 89			
TOTAL:						2,600					
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995)											
149-962	CONTROL TOWER				1 EA	2,500					
TOTAL:						2,500					
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
219-944	BASE MAINTENANCE SHOP				70,000 SF	4,750					
610-281	ALTER MOBILITY FACILITY				34,535 SF	1,500					
724-417	VISITING OFFICERS QUARTERS				80 PN	3,550					
841-427	ELEVATED WATER TANK				500 KG	1,250					
10. Mission or Major Functions: Headquarters First Air Force; a fighter wing with three F-15 squadrons which is responsible for training all F-15 aircrews, a weapons evaluation group, and a tactical aerial targets squadron (QF-106 aircraft); Southwest Air Defense Sector; the Air Force Civil Engineering Support Agency; and an Air National Guard fighter interceptor detachment (F-16 aircraft). Also, the temporary beddown location for the Air Training Command Water Survival School.											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:										0	
b. Water pollution:										800	
c. Occupational safety and health:										0	
d. Other Environmental:										0	

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)		2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION TYNDALL AIR FORCE BASE, FLORIDA,			4. PROJECT TITLE BASE SUPPLY LOGISTICS CENTER		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 2.75.96C	6. CATEGORY CODE 442-758	7. PROJECT NUMBER XLWU883012	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 2,600		
9. COST ESTIMATES					
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
BASE SUPPLY LOGISTICS CENTER		SF	21,400	92	1,969
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					385
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(80)
UTILITIES		LS			(100)
PAVEMENTS		SY	2,350	45	(105)
DEMOLITION (INCLUDING ASBESTOS)		SF	20,000	5	(100)
SUBTOTAL					2,354
CONTINGENCY (5%)					118
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					2,472
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					148
TOTAL REQUEST					2,620
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					2,600
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Concrete slab floor, steel frame, masonry walls, two story framing and roof system. Work includes all utilities, interior finishes, parking, and landscaping. Air Conditioning: 55 Tons.					
11. REQUIREMENT: 21,400 SF ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 16,740 SF PROJECT: Construct a base supply logistics center. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: A facility of adequate size and configuration is required for the efficient management of base supply operations and assets in order to support base and flying missions. Associated functions include stock control, requisitions, management systems, funds, supply readiness, material management, demand processing unit and squadron administration. This is Phase I of a three-phase program and constructs a base supply support and management facility. Phase II is for warehouse space and is programmed in FY 96 at \$3.2 million; and Phase III is hazardous material warehouse space and is programmed in FY 97 at \$2 0 million. CURRENT SITUATION: The widespread abestos contamination in the existing base supply logistics facility presents a serious potential health hazard to employees and customers. This WWII wood-frame building constructed on-slab has been rehabilitated several times over the past 48 years. Through these progressions of upgrades, the attic space has become littered with air cell asbestos pipe insulation debris. The fiber release of the discarded asbestos insulation has contaminated the entire attic space. The contamination has been confined to this space and all routine maintenance work in this facility has been suspended for the last three years. Due to the suspension of normal maintenance and repair, antiquated lighting and electrical power systems cannot be upgraded. The electrical system is in violation of national electrical codes. Computer and					

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION TYNDALL AIR FORCE BASE, FLORIDA,		
4. PROJECT TITLE BASE SUPPLY LOGISTICS CENTER	5. PROJECT NUMBER XLWU883012	
<p>communication systems cannot be expanded or connected to other facilities without routing dedicated cables through the attic space. This limitation prevents the installation of a computer network to span the physical separation of supply functions and reduce the current operational inefficiencies. The facility is not equipped with a fire sprinkler system nor does it have any fire wall partitions. These fire deficiencies in this wood-frame building pose a serious fire hazard. The wood construction has been plagued with termites over the years; however, routine inspections and corrective measures have been only partially successful. Unfortunately there are some areas that are impossible to inspect and, with the building having undergone severe settling over the years, the structural integrity is suspect. This project will demolish one facility (20,034 square feet) which is in the way of construction.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> People working in this facility will continue to be exposed to the risks of fire and asbestos. Inefficiencies associated with the condition and layout of the existing facility will remain unsolved.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of new construction, revitalization, leasing and status quo operation. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, new construction was found to be the most cost efficient over the life of the project. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements".</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION TYNDALL AIR FORCE BASE, FLORIDA,																								
4. PROJECT TITLE BASE SUPPLY LOGISTICS CENTER	5. PROJECT NUMBER XLW 883012																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA.</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="330 609 1404 756"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>87 MAY 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>100%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>87 MAY 21</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>89 JUN 01</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="330 798 1404 882"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="330 924 1404 1102"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>478</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>305</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>783</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>497</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>286</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	87 MAY 15	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	100%	(c) Date 35% Designed	87 MAY 21	(d) Date Design Complete	89 JUN 01	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	478	(b) All Other Design Costs	305	(c) Total	783	(d) Contract	497	(e) In-house	286
(a) Date Design Started	87 MAY 15																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	100%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	87 MAY 21																							
(d) Date Design Complete	89 JUN 01																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	478																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	305																							
(c) Total	783																							
(d) Contract	497																							
(e) In-house	286																							

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)						2. DATE			
AIR FORCE											
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION				4. COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX				
ROBINS AIR FORCE BASE, GEORGIA				AIR FORCE			0.77				
				MATERIEL COMMAND							
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	TOTAL
a. As of 30 SEP 92		754	3150	13599							17,503
b. End FY 1998		725	3025	11313							15,063
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (8,720)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)										466,871	
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:										61,720	
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:										43,370	
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)										27,950	
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:										97,120	
g. Remaining Deficiency:										0	
h. Grand Total:										697,031	
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE			SCOPE		COST (\$000)		DESIGN STATUS		
CODE									START		CMPL
141-000		JSTARS ADD TO AND ALTER OPERATIONS COMPLEX			45,000 SF		4,100		SEP 92		APR 93
141-753		JSTARS SQUADRON OPERATIONS/AMU			61,000 SF		7,500		SEP 92		MAR 93
211-111		JSTARS ADD TO AND ALTER MAINTENANCE COMPLEX			110,000 SF		9,300		SEP 92		APR 93
218-712		AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT PAINT FACILITY			3,600 SF		970		SEP 92		JUN 93
610-711		ADD TO AND ALTER LOGISTICAL SYSTEMS OPERATIONS CENTER			23,000 SF		3,000		SEP 92		SEP 93
721-312		ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES (DBOF)			272 PN		4,300		AUG 92		SEP 93
826-123		JSTARS ADD TO AND ALTER UTILITIES			LS		3,500		DEC 92		AUG 93
831-155		UPGRADE INDUSTRIAL WASTEWATER TREATMENT AND DISPOSAL PLANTS			LS		10,700		MAY 92		JUN 93
							TOTAL:		43,370		
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995)											
610-127		BASE ENGINEER COMPLEX, PHASE II			29,500 SF		3,650				
610-285		JSTARS ADD TO INTEGRATED SUPPORT FACILITY			14,000 SF		3,100				
610-675		ALTER WEAPON SYSTEMS SUPPORT CENTER, PHASE II			370,000 SF		4,200				
721-312		J-STARS DORMITORY			288 PN		5,525				
723-388		JSTARS EXPANDED FLIGHT KITCHEN			8,300 SF		1,850				
813-231		UPGRADE ELECTRICAL DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM			LS		3,800				
871-183		UPGRADE STORM DRAINAGE SYSTEM			LS		2,000				
900-000		JSTARS UTILITIES/MISCELLANEOUS SUPPORT			LS		3,825				
							TOTAL:		27,950		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)						2. DATE			
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ROBINS AIR FORCE BASE, GEORGIA				4. COMMAND AIR FORCE MATERIEL COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX 0.77				
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			TOTAL
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	
a. As of											
b. End FY											
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage:											
b. Inventory Total As Of:											
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:											
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:											
e. Authorization Included In Following Program:											
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:											
g. Remaining Deficiency:											
h. Grand Total:											
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
211-154		AIRCRAFT ORGANIZATIONAL MAINT				90,000 SF		7,000			
211-173		LARGE ACFT MAINTENANCE DOCK				34,200 SF		2,700			
211-179		FUEL SYSTEMS MAINTENANCE DOCK				35,000 SF		6,870			
422-256		AIM-120 MISSILE SUPPORT FACILITIES				6,600 SF		1,200			
442-758		MOBILIZATION/MAINTENANCE ISSUE FACILITY				70,000 SF		4,700			
10. Mission or Major Functions: Warner Robins Air Logistics Center which is responsible for logistics management, support, & depot-level maintenance of F-15, C-130, & C-141 aircraft, helicopters; tactical missiles, & avionics & electronic warfare systems; HQ AFRES; AMC air refueling wing with two KC-135 squadrons; ACC combat communications group; & an Air Force Space Command missile warning squadron which operates one of the Phased Array Warning System (Pave PAWS) radars. Also, the main operating base for the Joint Surveillance & Target Attack Radar System (JSTARS) aircraft.											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:											6,000
b. Water pollution:											4,000
c. Occupational safety and health:											0
d. Other Environmental:											0

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ROBINS AIR FORCE BASE, GEORGIA			4. PROJECT TITLE JSTARS ADD TO AND ALTER OPERATIONS COMPLEX			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 6.47.70	6. CATEGORY CODE TIARA	7. PROJECT NUMBER 141-000	UHZ943033	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 4,100		
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
JSTARS ADD TO AND ALTER OPERATIONS COMPLEX		SF	44,900		2,910	
WING HEADQUARTERS ALTERATION		SF	12,000	58	(696)	
WING HEADQUARTERS ADDITION		SF	6,200	105	(651)	
FIELD TRAINING ALTERATION		SF	10,800	24	(259)	
FIELD TRAINING ADDITION		SF	3,000	82	(246)	
CONSTRUCT LIFE SUPPORT FACILITY		SF	12,900	82	(1,058)	
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					625	
UTILITIES /SITE PREPARATION/PAVEMENTS		LS			(385)	
SPECIAL FOUNDATIONS AND PILINGS		LS			(240)	
SUBTOTAL					3,535	
CONTINGENCY (10%)					354	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					3,889	
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					233	
TOTAL REQUEST					4,122	
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					4,100	
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Construction includes reinforced concrete footings, floor slab and foundations, insulated maintenance free exterior walls, utilities, site improvements and necessary support. Alteration includes upgraded HVAC, electrical, fire detection, and security systems. Air Conditioning: 110 Tons.						
11. REQUIREMENT: 68,800 SF ADEQUATE: 23,000 SF SUBSTANDARD: 54,000 SF <u>PROJECT</u> : Add to and alter the Wing Headquarters facility and a field training detachment (FTD) facility. Construct a life support facility. (New Mission) <u>REQUIREMENT</u> : Management space, a command post, and space for support functions associated with the Joint Surveillance Target Attack Radar System (STARS) mission are required for the Wing Commander, the Operations Group Commander, and their staffs. Additional space is required in the FTD facility to provide technical instruction, mobile training sets, initial qualification training, and continuation training for Joint STARS maintenance personnel. The facility must be configured to accommodate the Computer Based Instructional Training System (CBITS). The Life Support Facility is required for storing and maintaining aircrew life support systems. A workshop area is required for servicing of equipment, and a logistics area is required for supervision, records and equipment distribution. Most of the facility will be used for controlled storage areas. All alteration and construction work associated with this project must be complete prior to the first aircraft arrival in January 1996. <u>CURRENT SITUATION</u> : All available management and training facilities are being fully utilized by other missions; thus they cannot accommodate Joint STARS without being expanded. No administrative facility is large enough						

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ROBINS AIR FORCE BASE, GEORGIA		
4. PROJECT TITLE JSTARS ADD TO AND ALTER OPERATIONS COMPLEX	5. PROJECT NUMBER UHHZ943033	
<p>or configured properly to accept the new headquarters function and meet TEMPEST security requirements. Likewise, the existing FTD facility cannot accommodate the complexity and size of Joint STARS mobile training sets/training aids, special tools, test equipment and training accessories in addition to their current training workload generated by KC-135 aircraft. A raised floor is required for the training modules, and the existing facility will not accommodate raised flooring. The KC-135 life support function is housed in a corner of the supply warehouse. Site constraints prohibit expansion of that portion of the building, plus the warehouse space is needed to meet the increased supply demands of the Joint STARS mission. The space vacated by the existing life support shop will be converted back to warehouse space in an FY 94 "JSTARS Add to and Alter Maintenance Complex" (UHHZ943032). No other base facility is available for modification to meet the requirement of the Joint STARS/KC-135 life support functions.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Failure to accomplish any portion of this project will result in the inability to support Joint STARS at this base and will adversely affect the combat mission capability of the Air Force, Army, and Allied units.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide." However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements." Joint STARS is an Air Force/Army system for real time detection, tracking, and attack of moving and stationary ground targets. The system will consist of an airborne segment on board E-8C configured aircraft and a mobile ground communication segment. All known alternative options were considered during the development of this project. No other option could meet the mission requirements; therefore, no economic analysis was needed or performed.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																																													
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ROBINS AIR FORCE BASE, GEORGIA																																															
4. PROJECT TITLE JSTARS ADD TO AND ALTER OPERATIONS COMPLEX	5. PROJECT NUMBER UHHZ943033																																														
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td colspan="3">(1) Status:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td></td> <td>92 SEP 30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td></td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td></td> <td>92 NOV 30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td></td> <td>93 APR 30</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(2) Basis:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td></td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td></td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td></td> <td>251</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td></td> <td>103</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td></td> <td>354</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> <td>251</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td></td> <td>103</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(4) Construction Start</td> <td></td> <td>94 JAN</td> </tr> </table> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(1) Status:			(a) Date Design Started		92 SEP 30	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%	(c) Date 35% Designed		92 NOV 30	(d) Date Design Complete		93 APR 30	(2) Basis:			(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A	(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)			(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		251	(b) All Other Design Costs		103	(c) Total		354	(d) Contract		251	(e) In-house		103	(4) Construction Start		94 JAN
(1) Status:																																															
(a) Date Design Started		92 SEP 30																																													
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%																																													
(c) Date 35% Designed		92 NOV 30																																													
(d) Date Design Complete		93 APR 30																																													
(2) Basis:																																															
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO																																													
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A																																													
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)																																															
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		251																																													
(b) All Other Design Costs		103																																													
(c) Total		354																																													
(d) Contract		251																																													
(e) In-house		103																																													
(4) Construction Start		94 JAN																																													

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)				2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ROBINS AIR FORCE BASE, GEORGIA			4. PROJECT TITLE JSTARS SQUADRON OPERATIONS/ AMU				
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 6.47.70 TIARA		6. CATEGORY CODE 141-753	7. PROJECT NUMBER UHZ943031		8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 7,500		
9. COST ESTIMATES							
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)		
JSTARS SQUADRON OPERATIONS/ AMU		SF	61,200		5,387		
SQUADRON OPERATIONS		SF	43,000	91	(3,913)		
AIRCRAFT MAINT UNIT		SF	16,000	81	(1,296)		
RELOCATE T-37 OPERATIONS/MAINT FAC		SF	2,200	81	(178)		
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					1,345		
UTILITIES		LS			(295)		
PAVEMENTS		LS			(425)		
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(195)		
SPECIAL FOUNDATIONS		LS			(430)		
SUBTOTAL					6,732		
CONTINGENCY (5%)					337		
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					7,069		
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					424		
TOTAL REQUEST					7,493		
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					7,500		
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Reinforced concrete footings, foundations, and floor slab, masonry exterior walls with maintenance free exterior surfaces, multi-story structural steel frame, sloped roof, electric security system, landscaping, connection to central chilled water plant, and all other utilities and necessary support to provide a complete and usable facility. Includes 1,950 SF vault for squadron operations. Air Conditioning: 340 Tons.							
11. REQUIREMENT: As required. <u>PROJECT</u> : Construct a squadron operations/AMU facility and a T-37 operations and maintenance facility. (New Mission) <u>REQUIREMENT</u> : This squadron operations/AMU facility is required to support the first of two Joint Surveillance Target Attack Radar System (STARS) squadrons to be assigned to this base. The facility should be located adjacent to the flightline to facilitate maintenance of JSTARS aircraft. The squadron operations facility is required for flight planning, briefing and critique of combat crews and to direct flight operations. It should be located with its respective maintenance unit. The AMU is required to perform maintenance on the various E-8C airframe systems and should be located adjacent to the flightline to optimize maintenance effectiveness. In addition, a training room is required for ongoing training of maintenance crews. Due to site constraints, the squadron operations facility and part of the AMU must be multi-story construction. An operations and maintenance facility is also required to support the T-37 Accelerated Copilot Enrichment (ACE) training program. The existing facility will be displaced by the FY 93 JSTARS apron expansion. <u>CURRENT SITUATION</u> : There are no adequate facilities available for use as a squadron operations or AMU facility at this installation. Existing							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ROBINS AIR FORCE BASE, GEORGIA		
4. PROJECT TITLE JSTARS SQUADRON OPERATIONS/ AMU	5. PROJECT NUMBER UHHZ943031	
<p>squadron operations facilities are being used by the KC-135 squadrons and are not large enough for the unique requirements of the JSTARS mission. The JSTARS crew consists of 22 personnel per aircraft versus four per KC-135; thus, a larger squadron operations facility is required. Existing AMU facilities are also fully utilized by existing maintenance operations. Currently, there are four T-37 aircraft assigned to support copilot training for the 19th Air Refueling Wing. The aircraft operations and maintenance facility for the T-37s is being displaced by the FY 93 project, "JSTARS Aircraft Parking Apron," because the current T-37 facility is located on the only area available for ramp expansion to support the Joint STARS beddown.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Squadron operations, and aircraft maintenance functions associated with the E-8C aircraft cannot be implemented effectively until this project is completed.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements". All known alternative options were considered during the development of this project. No other option could meet the mission requirements; therefore, no economic analysis was needed or performed. Joint STARS is an Air Force/Army program for real time detection, tracking, and attack on moving and stationary enemy ground targets. The system will consist of an airborne segment on board an E-8C configured aircraft and a mobile ground communication segment.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ROBINS AIR FORCE BASE, GEORGIA																								
4. PROJECT TITLE JSTARS SQUADRON OPERATIONS/ AMU	5. PROJECT NUMBER UHHZ943031																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="355 611 1409 741"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 SEP 30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 NOV 30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 MAR 30</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="355 804 1326 867"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="355 930 1409 1087"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>195</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>84</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>279</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>195</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>84</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 JAN</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 SEP 30	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 NOV 30	(d) Date Design Complete	93 MAR 30	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	195	(b) All Other Design Costs	84	(c) Total	279	(d) Contract	195	(e) In-house	84
(a) Date Design Started	92 SEP 30																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 NOV 30																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 MAR 30																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	195																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	84																							
(c) Total	279																							
(d) Contract	195																							
(e) In-house	84																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ROBINS AIR FORCE BASE, GEORGIA			4. PROJECT TITLE JSTARS ADD TO AND ALTER MAINTENANCE COMPLEX			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 6.47.70 TIARA	6. CATEGORY CODE 211-111	7. PROJECT NUMBER UHHZ943032	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 9,300			
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
JSTARS ADD TO AND ALTER MAINT COMPLEX					6,484	
CONSTRUCT MULTIPURPOSE HANGAR		SF	51,500	100	(5,150)	
ALTER AIRCRAFT PARTS STORE & WAREHOUSE		SF	40,000	9	(360)	
CONST VAULT IN PARTS STORE/WAREHOUSE		SF	3,000	100	(300)	
ALTER ENVIRONMENTAL TEST FACILITY		SF	4,600	50	(230)	
ALTER AVIONICS & MAINTENANCE FACILITY		SF	11,100	40	(444)	
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					1,860	
UTILITIES/SPECIAL AIR HANDLING		LS			(1,630)	
SPECIAL FOUNDATIONS/PAVEMENTS		LS			(230)	
SUBTOTAL					8,344	
CONTINGENCY (5%)					417	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					8,761	
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					526	
TOTAL REQUEST					9,287	
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					9,300	
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Reinforced concrete footings, special foundations for high water table and low bearing capacity soils, concrete floor slabs, masonry walls, fire protection, aircraft access pavement to hangar, utilities, site improvements and parking, system O&M manuals and all necessary support. Air Conditioning: 220 Tons.						
11. REQUIREMENT: As required. <u>PROJECT</u> : Construct a hangar; add to and alter a warehouse to serve as a parts store; alter facilities for aircraft environmental and avionics functions. (New Mission) <u>REQUIREMENT</u> : A large aircraft hangar is required to fully enclose the Joint Surveillance Target Attack Radar System (STARS) aircraft to allow removal and maintenance of the radar and sensor equipment. The same facility will be used to perform airframe maintenance and corrosion control and serve as a parts fabrication shop. An air handling system is required to safely filter volatile organic compounds and to create optimum airflow for paint application. A warehouse to serve as an aircraft generation squadron (AGS) parts store and to distribute mobility readiness spares packages (MRSP) is required to support both Joint STARS and KC-135 squadrons. The 3,000 SF addition to the warehouse is a secure storage area required for classified contents of the MRSPs. Facilities are also required to support a Contractor Operated Maintenance and Base Supply (COMBS), part of Joint STARS contractor-operated supply and maintenance support. A facility is required for avionics maintenance and maintenance and logistics management functions. <u>CURRENT SITUATION</u> : No facility exists to fully enclose the Joint STARS aircraft and protect the expensive, unique electronics during maintenance.						

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ROBINS AIR FORCE BASE, GEORGIA		
4. PROJECT TITLE JSTARS ADD TO AND ALTER MAINTENANCE COMPLEX	5. PROJECT NUMBER UHHZ943032	
<p>Existing hangars are inadequate in size and are fully used by aircraft currently assigned to the base. There is no facility at Robins to handle Joint STARS corrosion control requirements in compliance with the Clean Air Act and Occupational Safety and Health regulations. Existing corrosion control facilities at Robins are already in full use to support other assigned aircraft. The existing aircraft parts store and warehouse are not large enough to accommodate both the E-8 and KC-135 squadrons. Combining both warehouse operations in a single facility will eliminate duplication of warehouse space. Life support currently occupies a portion of this building, but will relocate to the FY 94 "JSTARS Add to and Alter Operations Complex," freeing up warehouse space. Existing facilities for environmental systems and avionics maintenance are not properly configured to accommodate Joint STARS equipment. Additionally, space is not available for maintenance and logistics management staffs.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> The base will not be able to adequately support the beddown of Joint STARS. New mission aircraft will not receive corrosion control and required maintenance. Failure to maintain each aircraft in a safe and ready state will adversely affect the combat mission capability of the Air Force, Army, and Allied battle units.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide." However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements." This project is critical to the beddown of Joint STARS, which is an Air Force/Army program for real time detection, tracking and attack of moving and stationary ground targets. The system will consist of an airborne segment on board E-8C configured aircraft and a mobile ground communication segment. All known alternative options were considered during the development of this project. No other option could meet the mission requirements; therefore, no economic analysis was needed or performed.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ROBINS AIR FORCE BASE, GEORGIA																								
4. PROJECT TITLE JSTARS ADD TO AND ALTER MAINTENANCE COMPLEX	5. PROJECT NUMBER UHZ943032																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 SEP 30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 NOV 30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 APR 30</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>447</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>198</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>645</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>447</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>198</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 JAN</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 SEP 30	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 NOV 30	(d) Date Design Complete	93 APR 30	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	447	(b) All Other Design Costs	198	(c) Total	645	(d) Contract	447	(e) In-house	198
(a) Date Design Started	92 SEP 30																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 NOV 30																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 APR 30																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	447																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	198																							
(c) Total	645																							
(d) Contract	447																							
(e) In-house	198																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)		2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ROBINS AIR FORCE BASE, GEORGIA			4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO AND ALTER LOGISTICAL SYSTEMS OPERATIONS CENTER		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 7.28.96	6. CATEGORY CODE 610-711	7. PROJECT NUMBER UHHZ9Q3000	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 3,000		
9. COST ESTIMATES					
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
ADD TO AND ALTER LOGISTICAL SYSTEMS OPERATIONS CENTER		LS			2,308
ADDITION		SF	23,000	96	(2,208)
ALTERATION		LS			(100)
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					420
UTILITIES		LS			(100)
PAVEMENTS		LS			(40)
DEMOLITION		SF	58,000	4	(230)
COMMUNICATIONS SUPPORT		LS			(50)
SUBTOTAL					2,728
CONTINGENCY (5%)					136
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					2,864
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					172
TOTAL REQUEST					3,036
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					3,000
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Concrete foundation and floor, concrete block and masonry veneer walls, roof system and earthen berm to match existing. Project includes 10,500 SF raised floor computer room, fire suppression, tie-in to existing building, demolition of wood building and necessary support. Air Conditioning: 75 Tons.					
11. REQUIREMENT: 100,000 SF ADEQUATE: 77,000 SF SUBSTANDARD: 50,700 SF PROJECT: Add to and alter a logistical systems operations center. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: An adequate facility is required to accommodate consolidation of vital, compatible logistics management computer systems, expanded storage and communications devices, and support functions. Timeliness of this project is critical for this operations center to assume its role as an AF Regional Processing Center in the fourth quarter of FY 1994. These expanded operations centers require space for computers, operations support areas and support equipment. Storage requirements have also increased for computer hardware, magnetic tapes, disks and peripherals as transitions are made to emerging technologies and more efficient operational concepts. Information systems process over 200 different data systems covering all materials managed, stored and used at Robins Air Force Base. CURRENT SITUATION: Existing floor space is inadequate for current and planned computer systems and their required support areas. The growth in computer systems has exceeded present cooling and electrical capacities. Some computer systems remain in a substandard facility, forcing management to split their operations. Space required to achieve efficiencies dictated by various Defense Management Review Decisions (DMRD) and Air					

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ROBINS AIR FORCE BASE, GEORGIA		
4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO AND ALTER LOGISTICAL SYSTEMS OPERATIONS CENTER	5. PROJECT NUMBER UHHZ903000	
<p>Force program actions is not available. Manpower reductions, predicated upon the availability of additional computer space, have already been implemented. Completion of this project will allow demolition of one 58,000 SF WWII vintage wood building.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> This Air Logistics Center's mission will be critically impaired if vital systems cannot function properly and be consolidated as mandated in DMRDs 924, 925 and 931, all directing consolidation/merging of ADP operations. Predicted efficiencies in energy and manpower will not be realized. Material deliveries and depot maintenance functions, dependent upon ADP products, will be delayed.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> This project meets the criteria/scope specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of new construction, revitalization, leasing and status quo operation. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, an addition to the present facility was found to be the most cost efficient over the life of the project.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ROBINS AIR FORCE BASE, GEORGIA																								
4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO AND ALTER LOGISTICAL SYSTEMS OPERATIONS CENTER	5. PROJECT NUMBER UHHZ903000																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 SEP 20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 OCT 25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 SEP 15</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>YES</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>ROBINS</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>180</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>70</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>250</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>204</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>46</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 SEP 20	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 OCT 25	(d) Date Design Complete	93 SEP 15	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	YES	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	ROBINS	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	180	(b) All Other Design Costs	70	(c) Total	250	(d) Contract	204	(e) In-house	46
(a) Date Design Started	92 SEP 20																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 OCT 25																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 SEP 15																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	YES																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	ROBINS																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	180																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	70																							
(c) Total	250																							
(d) Contract	204																							
(e) In-house	46																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ROBINS AIR FORCE BASE, GEORGIA			4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES (DBOF)			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 7.28.96	6. CATEGORY CODE 721-312	7. PROJECT NUMBER UHHZ933001	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 4,300			
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES (DBOF)		SF	57,200		3,176	
ADDITION		SF	6,700	67	(449)	
ALTERATION		SF	50,500	54	(2,727)	
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					530	
UTILITIES		LS			(290)	
PAVEMENTS		LS			(85)	
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(110)	
COMMUNICATIONS SUPPORT		LS			(45)	
SUBTOTAL					3,706	
CONTINGENCY (10%)					371	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					4,077	
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					245	
TOTAL REQUEST					4,322	
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					4,300	
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Alter interior partitioning to provide room-bath-room modules, exterior entrances and balconies; extend roofline and upgrade exterior; install cable TV system; upgrade laundry rooms, HVAC and utility systems, provide insulation and necessary support.						
11. REQUIREMENT: 1,526 PN ADEQUATE: 960 PN SUBSTANDARD: 272 PN PROJECT: Add to and alter two dormitories. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: A major Air Force objective is to provide unaccompanied enlisted personnel with housing conducive to their proper rest, relaxation and personal well-being. Properly designed and furnished quarters providing some degree of individual privacy are essential to the successful accomplishment of the increasingly complicated and important jobs which these people must perform. CURRENT SITUATION: The buildings were constructed in 1960 when standards of construction for bachelor quarters were considerably lower. Common latrines, inadequate lighting, poor insulation and sound attenuation, obsolete electrical and mechanical systems, and lack of privacy are major deficiencies of these facilities. This is the third phase of a three phase effort to provide adequate quarters for enlisted personnel at this base. IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: Substandard living conditions will continue to degrade the morale, productivity and career satisfaction of enlisted personnel assigned to this base. ADDITIONAL: This project meets the criteria/scope specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". While it is recognized that the initial cost of renovating these facilities exceeds 70 percent of the replacement cost, a life-cycle economic analysis has been performed comparing all reasonable options for accomplishing this project						

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ROBINS AIR FORCE BASE, GEORGIA		
4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER UHHZ933001	
<p>(status quo, renovation, new construction, and leasing). This analysis indicates the renovation alternative is the most economical over the life of the facility.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																																													
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ROBINS AIR FORCE BASE, GEORGIA																																															
4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER UHHZ933001																																														
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td colspan="3">(1) Status:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td></td> <td>92 AUG 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td></td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td></td> <td>92 OCT 25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td></td> <td>93 SEP 30</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(2) Basis:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td></td> <td>YES</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td></td> <td>ROBINS</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td></td> <td>155</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td></td> <td>110</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td></td> <td>265</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> <td>178</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td></td> <td>87</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(4) Construction Start</td> <td></td> <td>94 MAR</td> </tr> </table> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(1) Status:			(a) Date Design Started		92 AUG 15	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%	(c) Date 35% Designed		92 OCT 25	(d) Date Design Complete		93 SEP 30	(2) Basis:			(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		YES	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		ROBINS	(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)			(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		155	(b) All Other Design Costs		110	(c) Total		265	(d) Contract		178	(e) In-house		87	(4) Construction Start		94 MAR
(1) Status:																																															
(a) Date Design Started		92 AUG 15																																													
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%																																													
(c) Date 35% Designed		92 OCT 25																																													
(d) Date Design Complete		93 SEP 30																																													
(2) Basis:																																															
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		YES																																													
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		ROBINS																																													
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)																																															
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		155																																													
(b) All Other Design Costs		110																																													
(c) Total		265																																													
(d) Contract		178																																													
(e) In-house		87																																													
(4) Construction Start		94 MAR																																													

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ROBINS AIR FORCE BASE, GEORGIA			4. PROJECT TITLE JSTARS ADD TO AND ALTER UTILITIES			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 6.47.70 TIARA		6. CATEGORY CODE 826-123	7. PROJECT NUMBER UHZ943030	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 3,500		
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
JSTARS ADD TO AND ALTER UTILITIES					2,662	
INDUSTRIAL WASTEWATER SYSTEM		LF	20,000	39	(780)	
SANITARY SEWER SYSTEM		LF	20,000	39	(780)	
CHILLED WATER PLANT BUILDING		SF	2,250	88	(198)	
CHILLED WATER PLANT AND DISTRIBUTION		TN	800	1,130	(904)	
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					490	
LIFT STATIONS, HOLDING TANKS, CONTROLS		LS			(245)	
PAVEMENTS		LS			(20)	
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(70)	
SPECIAL FOUNDATIONS AND PILINGS		LS			(155)	
SUBTOTAL					3,152	
CONTINGENCY (5%)					158	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					3,310	
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					199	
TOTAL REQUEST					3,509	
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					3,500	
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Construct an industrial waste collection system and add to and alter an existing sanitary sewer system to include lift stations, holding tanks and controls. Construct a central chilled water plant. Includes pavements, site improvements, system O&M manuals and all required support.						
11. REQUIREMENT: As required.						
<u>PROJECT:</u> Upgrade waste water collection system and install a central chilled water plant. (New Mission)						
<u>REQUIREMENT:</u> An environmentally sound and adequately sized wastewater and industrial waste collection system and a central chilled water plant are required to support the beddown of all new Joint Surveillance Target Attack Radar System (STARS) facilities. The Joint STARS beddown area borders on wetlands, so the wastewater and industrial waste collection system must conform to the most strict Clean Water Act implementing guidance. To most efficiently meet the cooling demands of the new Joint STARS facilities, a central chiller plant is required.						
<u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> The existing wastewater and industrial waste collection system is over 30 years old and cannot reliably support the added demand associated with the Joint STARS beddown. Also, the existing lines lead to an off-base treatment facility that will be taken out of service after 1994. The new lines will lead to base treatment facilities. There is no central chilled water plant in the Joint STARS beddown area. Each new facility must be connected to a central cooling source or have its own individual chiller system. Economy of scale and energy efficiency can be optimized by constructing a central plant.						
<u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Adequate waste water and industrial waste collection systems will not be available to support new Joint STARS						

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ROBINS AIR FORCE BASE, GEORGIA		
4. PROJECT TITLE JSTARS ADD TO AND ALTER UTILITIES	5. PROJECT NUMBER UHHZ943030	
<p>facilities. Without a central chiller plant, individual facilities would have to include stand-alone chillers, which would entail greater utility costs and maintenance effort.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide;" however, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements." This project is critical to the beddown of Joint Stars, a joint Army/Air Force system for real time detection, tracking, and attack of moving and stationary targets. The system consists of an airborne segment onboard E-8C configured aircraft and a mobile ground communication segment. All known alternative options were considered during the development of this project. No other option could meet the mission requirements; therefore, no economic analysis was needed or performed.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																		
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ROBINS AIR FORCE BASE, GEORGIA																				
4. PROJECT TITLE JSTARS ADD TO AND ALTER UTILITIES	5. PROJECT NUMBER UHH2943030																			
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="370 621 1422 747"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 DEC 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 DEC 16</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 AUG 30</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <p>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</p> <p>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</p> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="370 940 1422 1100"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>216</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>162</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>378</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>295</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>83</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 DEC 01	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 DEC 16	(d) Date Design Complete	93 AUG 30	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	216	(b) All Other Design Costs	162	(c) Total	378	(d) Contract	295	(e) In-house	83
(a) Date Design Started	92 DEC 01																			
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																			
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 DEC 16																			
(d) Date Design Complete	93 AUG 30																			
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	216																			
(b) All Other Design Costs	162																			
(c) Total	378																			
(d) Contract	295																			
(e) In-house	83																			

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)		2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ROBINS AIR FORCE BASE, GEORGIA			4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE INDUSTRIAL WASTEWATER TREATMENT AND DISPOSAL PLANTS		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 7.80.56	6. CATEGORY CODE 831-155	7. PROJECT NUMBER UHHZ943007	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 10,700		
9. COST ESTIMATES					
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
UPGRADE INDUSTRIAL WASTEWATER TREATMENT AND DISPOSAL PLANTS		LS			7,450
UPGRADE INDUSTRIAL WASTE TREAT PLANT		LS			(6,800)
UPGRADE SANITARY SEWAGE TREAT PLANT		LS			(650)
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					1,750
UTILITIES		LS			(850)
PAVEMENTS		LS			(150)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS/DEMOLITION		LS			(500)
O&M MANUAL, TRAINING AND START-UP		LS			(250)
SUBTOTAL					9,200
CONTINGENCY (10%)					920
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					10,120
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					607
TOTAL REQUEST					10,727
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					10,700
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Upgrade metal precipitation and removal process, including upgrade/installation of mixer, clarifier, oil separator, activated sludge and metal removal systems, final filtration and instrumentation; install digester and sludge drying beds at sewage plant. Includes necessary support construction and 180 day start-up operations and certification by contractor.					
11. REQUIREMENT: As required. <u>PROJECT</u> : Upgrade an industrial wastewater treatment plant (IWTP) and a sewage treatment plant (STP). (Current Mission) <u>REQUIREMENT</u> : This is a Level II environmental compliance project. Adequate industrial wastewater and sewage treatment plants are required to remove pollutants from industrial and sanitary wastewater. Industrial wastewater pollutants are generated by depot maintenance activities such as aircraft overhaul, metal plating, painting and paint stripping. The treatment process must produce an effluent which meets future federal and state water and air quality standards. To further control in-stream toxicity levels, wastewater discharge limits governing Robins Air Force Base will be reduced even further when the State of Georgia renews the base discharge permit in December 1993. State representatives have indicated such during recent negotiations and public hearings. <u>CURRENT SITUATION</u> : The State of Georgia, which is mandated by federal law under the Clean Water Act, has issued a permit to Robins Air Force Base for operation of industrial and sanitary wastewater treatment plants. The permit requires the plants to meet very stringent discharge standards. This upgrade is required to ensure that the plants can meet the current discharge limits and the lower limits that will be imposed when the discharge permit is renewed in December 1993. The treatment process					

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ROBINS AIR FORCE BASE, GEORGIA		
4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE INDUSTRIAL WASTEWATER TREATMENT AND DISPOSAL PLANTS	5. PROJECT NUMBER UHHZ943007	
<p>currently includes two IWTPs and one STP. The two IWTPs must be upgraded and combined into one plant to ensure effective state-of-the-art removal of metals and other pollutants. The effluent from one IWTP currently goes through the STP for final treatment. This action must be terminated as pollutants in the IWTP effluent contaminate STP sludge, making it a hazardous waste. IWTP upgrade must provide the final treatment now provided by the STP. In addition, the STP must be upgraded with tertiary treatment to allow it to meet lowered discharge limits for Biological Oxygen Demand.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Robins Air Force Base will not be able to treat wastewater to meet lower standards imposed by its permit. Penalties could be imposed or the base could be required to discontinue industrial operations, thereby adversely impacting its mission.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There is no criteria/scope for this project in either Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide" or Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements". Scope of project was developed through engineering analysis of processes required and projected wastewater flow. A preliminary analysis of all known alternative options was done. No other option could meet the mission requirements; therefore, no economic analysis was needed or performed. A certificate of exemption was prepared.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ROBINS AIR FORCE BASE, GEORGIA																								
4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE INDUSTRIAL WASTEWATER TREATMENT AND DISPOSAL PLANTS	5. PROJECT NUMBER UHHZ943007																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="313 617 1362 755"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 MAY 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 SEP 20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 JUN 30</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="313 819 1280 883"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="313 946 1362 1106"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>125</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>370</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>495</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>297</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>198</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 MAY 01	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 SEP 20	(d) Date Design Complete	93 JUN 30	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	125	(b) All Other Design Costs	370	(c) Total	495	(d) Contract	297	(e) In-house	198
(a) Date Design Started	92 MAY 01																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 SEP 20																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 JUN 30																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	125																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	370																							
(c) Total	495																							
(d) Contract	297																							
(e) In-house	198																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)						2. DATE			
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION HICKAM AIR FORCE BASE, HAWAII						4. COMMAND PACIFIC AIR FORCES			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX 1.34		
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			TOTAL
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	
a. As of 30 SEP 92		687	2678	1412	151	284	28	27	62	31	5,360
b. End FY 1998		654	2506	1413	151	284	28	27	62	31	5,156
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (7,786)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)											487,173
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:											18,520
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:											10,250
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)											9,550
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:											37,600
g. Remaining Deficiency:											0
h. Grand Total:											563,093
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE		SCOPE		COST (\$000)		DESIGN STATUS			
<u>CODE</u>								<u>START</u>		<u>CMPL</u>	
131-132		MILSTAR COMMUNICATIONS GROUND TERMINAL		1,600 SF		2,200		MAR 92		DEC 93	
411-135		UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS		LS		2,100		JUL 92		JUL 93	
721-312		DORMITORY		192 PN		5,950		JUL 92		OCT 93	
				TOTAL:		10,250					
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995)											
411-135		UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS		46 EA		6,800					
721-315		ALTER DORMITORY		62 PN		2,750					
				TOTAL:		9,550					
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
113-321		UPGRADE AIRFIELD APRON, PH 1		62,000 SY		7,000					
442-257		FLAMMABLE STORAGE WAREHOUSE		11,500 SF		1,200					
610-284		RENOVATE HQ PACAF COMPLEX PHIV		52,000 SF		2,400					
610-284		RENOV HQ PACAF COMPLEX PH V		47,000 SF		3,000					
721-312		ALTER UNACCOMPANIED ENLISTED DORMITORY		352 PN		5,000					
10. Mission or Major Functions: Headquarters Pacific Air Forces; an air base wing (C-135 aircraft); an Air Force Intelligence Command intelligence wing; an Air Mobility Command airlift support group; and Air National Guard fighter squadron (F-15 and F-5 aircraft) and composite group (C-130 aircraft).											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:											0
b. Water pollution:											6,800
c. Occupational safety and health:											0
d. Other Environmental:											0

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION HICKAM AIR FORCE BASE, HAWAII			4. PROJECT TITLE MILSTAR COMMUNICATIONS GROUND TERMINAL			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 3.36.01	6. CATEGORY CODE 131-132	7. PROJECT NUMBER KNMD933022	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 2,200			
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
MILSTAR GROUND COMMUNICATIONS TERMINAL		SF	1,600	560	396	
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					1,060	
UTILITIES		LS			(350)	
PAVEMENTS		SY	147	68	(10)	
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(330)	
HEMP SHIELDING		SF	5,200	65	(340)	
AUXILIARY GENERATORS		KW	120	250	(30)	
SUBTOTAL					1,956	
CONTINGENCY (5%)					98	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					2,054	
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6.5%)					134	
TOTAL REQUEST					2,188	
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					2,200	
EQUIPMENT FROM OTHER APPROPRIATIONS (NON-ADD)					(4,650)	
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Reinforced concrete walls, concrete floor slab, foundation and roof system. Includes HEMP shielding, acoustic wall and ceiling panels, standby generators with auto transfer equipment, fire protection system, and utilities. Air Conditioning: 10 Tons.						
11. REQUIREMENT: 1,600 SF ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 0 <u>PROJECT</u> : Construct a Milstar Ground Communications Terminal facility. (New Mission). <u>REQUIREMENT</u> : A facility is required to house a Milstar Ground Communications Terminal. The Milstar system, via satellites, provides the National Command Authority (NCA) with the only worldwide, secure, two-way, anti-jam, survivable, low probability of detection/interception voice and data communication capability. <u>CURRENT SITUATION</u> : No facilities exist to support the ground terminal segment of the Milstar system. <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED</u> : Without this project, critical connectivity between NORAD/Space Command and other high priority users, including the NCA, would be lost during crises denying the ability to command and control military forces through all levels of conflict. The Milstar terminal equipment for this site is scheduled for delivery in 1995. <u>ADDITIONAL</u> : The requirement for HEMP hardening is approved. There are no criteria for this project in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements," or in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide."						

1. COMPONENT	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)		2. DATE
AIR FORCE			
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION			
HICKAM AIR FORCE BASE, HAWAII			
4. PROJECT TITLE		5. PROJECT NUMBER	
MILSTAR COMMUNICATIONS GROUND TERMINAL		KNMD933022	
12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:			
a. Estimated Design Data:			
(1) Status:			
(a) Date Design Started		92 MAR 19	
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%	
(c) Date 35% Designed		92 OCT 14	
(d) Date Design Complete		93 DEC 01	
(2) Basis:			
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO	
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A	
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e):			(\$000)
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications			132
(b) All Other Design Costs			66
(c) Total			198
(d) Contract			
(e) In-house			198
(4) Construction Start			94 FEB
b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations:			
EQUIPMENT NOMENCLATURE	PROCURING APPROPRIATION	FISCAL YEAR APPROPRIATED OR REQUESTED	COST (\$000)
MILSTAR TERMINAL EQUIPMENT	3080	FY 95	4200
EHF/UHF ANTENNA SUPPORT SHELTER	3080	FY 95	250
SOLID STATE UPS SYSTEM	3080	FY 95	200

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION HICKAM AIR FORCE BASE, HAWAII			4. PROJECT TITLE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 2.74.56P	6. CATEGORY CODE 411-135	7. PROJECT NUMBER KNMD943012	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 2,100			
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS		LS			1,405	
REPLACE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS		EA	11	115,000	(1,265)	
REMOVE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS		EA	4	35,000	(140)	
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					470	
CONTAINMENT DIKES		EA	11	5,909	(65)	
CATHODIC PROTECTION/DETECTION DEVICES		EA	11	7,273	(80)	
EXCAVATION/BACKFILL		EA	11	25,000	(275)	
SOIL TESTING/DISPOSAL		EA	11	4,545	(50)	
SUBTOTAL					1,875	
CONTINGENCY (5%)					94	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					1,969	
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6.5%)					128	
TOTAL REQUEST					2,097	
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					2,100	
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Replace, upgrade or remove 15 Underground Storage Tanks (UST). Includes removal, installation of new tanks with release detection, piping, encasement or containment dikes, spill and overflow prevention devices, cathodic protection, soil testing/disposal, site work, utilities and other necessary support.						
11. REQUIREMENT: As required. <u>PROJECT:</u> Replaces and upgrades fifteen (15) underground fuel storage tanks. (Current Mission) <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> This is a Level II environmental compliance project. Upgrade of all USTs regulated by 40 CFR 280 to new construction standards is required. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has set standards that require all regulated USTs to have leak detection, corrosion protection, and spill/overflow prevention systems by December 1998. If USTs are replaced, Air Force policy is to replace them with aboveground tanks or to relocate them into underground vaults wherever possible. However, existing underground petroleum products storage tanks which are in good condition may be upgraded in place to bring them into compliance with applicable UST standards. This project is first phase to bring Hickam AFB underground tanks into compliance and will be followed by three more phased projects to complete the remaining tanks. <u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> Underground fuel storage tanks are aging and do not meet EPA requirements. This project is the first phase and addresses 15 of 41 USTS requiring action. Many are over 30 years old and are steel tanks which are unlined/unprotected. The EPA's cause-of-release study indicates unprotected steel tanks over 15 years of age represent the highest potential leakage threat. While the tanks have been tested for leaks, they do not have the necessary corrosion protection, spill/overflow						

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION HICKAM AIR FORCE BASE, HAWAII		
4. PROJECT TITLE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	5. PROJECT NUMBER KNMD943012	
<p>prevention and leak detection devices necessary to protect the environment.</p> <p>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: Failure to take corrective action will result in underground storage tanks which do not meet regulatory requirements. After 22 December 1998, the US Air Force would be open to EPA Notice of Violations, monetary penalties and possible litigation could force compliance and remediation. The potential for soil/groundwater contamination would remain.</p> <p>ADDITIONAL: There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements". A preliminary analysis of reasonable options for accomplishing this project (status quo, renovation, new construction, and leasing) was done. It indicates there is only one option that satisfies statutory requirements. Because of this, a full economic analysis was not performed. A certificate of exclusion has been prepared.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION HICKAM AIR FORCE BASE, HAWAII		
4. PROJECT TITLE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	5. PROJECT NUMBER KNMD943012	
12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:		
a. Estimated Design Data:		
(1) Status:		
(a) Date Design Started		92 JUL 15
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%
(c) Date 35% Designed		92 OCT 02
(d) Date Design Complete		93 JUL 19
(2) Basis:		
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e):		
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		(\$000) 110
(b) All Other Design Costs		116
(c) Total		226
(d) Contract		140
(e) In-house		86
(4) Construction Start		
		94 JAN
b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION HICKAM AIR FORCE BASE, HAWAII			4. PROJECT TITLE DORMITORY			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 2.75.96		6. CATEGORY CODE 721-312	7. PROJECT NUMBER KNMD933021R1	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 5,950		
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
DORMITORY (120 PN)		SF	24,000	165	3,960	
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					1,355	
UTILITIES		LS			(450)	
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(180)	
PAVEMENTS		LS			(300)	
SOLAR APPLICATIONS		LS			(165)	
SPECIAL FOUNDATIONS		LS			(185)	
COMMUNICATIONS SUPPORT		LS			(75)	
SUBTOTAL					5,315	
CONTINGENCY (5%)					266	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					5,581	
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6.5%)					363	
TOTAL REQUEST					5,944	
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					5,950	
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Reinforced concrete foundation and floor slabs, masonry walls, roof system, fire protection, utilities and other necessary support. Includes room-bath-room modules, laundries, storage and lounge areas, support space, landscaping, and handicapped access to first floor common areas. Air Conditioning: 132 Tons. Grade Mix: 120 E1-E4.						
11. REQUIREMENT: 1,471 PN ADEQUATE: 51 PN SUBSTANDARD: 993 PN <u>PROJECT:</u> Construct dormitory. (Current Mission) <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> A major Air Force objective provides unaccompanied enlisted personnel with housing conducive to their proper rest, relaxation and personal well-being. Properly designed and furnished quarters providing some degree of individual privacy are essential to the successful accomplishment of the increasingly complicated and important jobs these people must perform. <u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> There is a shortage of dormitories to accommodate the on-base unaccompanied enlisted housing requirement, thus personnel are forced to compete for housing off-base in an already limited housing market. Occupancy rate for existing dormitories is 96 percent, with balance of assigned enlisted personnel (over 400 persons) forced to find housing off-base. To compound this undesirable situation, the off-base housing costs are among the most expensive in the United States. <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Adequate living quarters will continue to be unavailable resulting in degradation of morale, productivity, and career satisfaction for unaccompanied enlisted personnel. <u>ADDITIONAL:</u> An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of new construction, revitalization, leasing and status quo operation. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective						

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION HICKAM AIR FORCE BASE, HAWAII		
4. PROJECT TITLE DORMITORY	5. PROJECT NUMBER KNMD933021R1	
<p>alternatives, new construction was found to be the most cost efficient over the life of the project. This project meets the criteria/scope specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide".</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION HICKAM AIR FORCE BASE, HAWAII																								
4. PROJECT TITLE DORMITORY	5. PROJECT NUMBER KNMD933021R1																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 JUL 13</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 AUG 05</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 OCT 01</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>YES</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>HICKAM</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>270</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>205</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>475</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>425</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 JUL 13	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 AUG 05	(d) Date Design Complete	93 OCT 01	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	YES	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	HICKAM	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	270	(b) All Other Design Costs	205	(c) Total	475	(d) Contract	50	(e) In-house	425
(a) Date Design Started	92 JUL 13																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 AUG 05																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 OCT 01																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	YES																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	HICKAM																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	270																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	205																							
(c) Total	475																							
(d) Contract	50																							
(e) In-house	425																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)					2. DATE		
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION KAENA POINT SATELLITE TRACKING SITE, HAWAII				4. COMMAND PACIFIC AIR FORCES		5. AREA CONST COST INDEX 1.34			
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT		STUDENTS		SUPPORTED		TOTAL	
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV		
a. As of 30 SEP 92									
b. End FY 1998									
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)									
a. Total Acreage: (153)							
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)								8,151	
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:								0	
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:								7,350	
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)								0	
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:								0	
g. Remaining Deficiency:								0	
h. Grand Total:								15,501	
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994									
CATEGORY						COST		DESIGN STATUS	
CODE	PROJECT TITLE			SCOPE		(\$000)	START	CMPL	
811-145	POWER PLANT			1 SF		7,350	MAY 92	DEC 93	
					TOTAL:	7,350			
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995) NONE									
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:									
10. Mission or Major Functions: An Air Force Space Command down range missile and satellite tracking station supporting the Western Space and Missile Center.									
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:									
a. Air pollution:								0	
b. Water pollution:								0	
c. Occupational safety and health:								0	
d. Other Environmental:								0	

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)		2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION KAENA POINT SATELLITE TRACKING SITE, HAWAII			4. PROJECT TITLE POWER PLANT		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 3.59.96	6. CATEGORY CODE 811-145	7. PROJECT NUMBER LXHY943024	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 7,350		
9. COST ESTIMATES					
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
POWER PLANT		LS			5,322
NEW POWER PLANT BLDG		SF	8,500	180	(1,530)
NEW GENERATORS		KW	2,400	830	(1,992)
PORTABLE LOAD BANK		EA	1	250,000	(250)
HIGH VOLTAGE SWITCHGEAR		LS			(1,550)
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					1,225
UTILITIES		LS			(560)
DEMOLITION OF EXIST GENERATORS		LS			(465)
SITE WORK		LS			(150)
PAVEMENTS		LS			(50)
SUBTOTAL					6,547
CONTINGENCY (5%)					327
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					6,874
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6.5%)					447
TOTAL REQUEST					7,321
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					7,350
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Construct new power plant, install 12 KV switchgear to interface with existing system. Provide new load bank for testing and maintenance. Install new aboveground fuel tanks and lines, underground feeders, fire alarm system, and comm lines. Remove old generators, convert exist power plant to storage and maint use. Air Conditioning: 6 Tons.					
11. REQUIREMENT: 2,400 KW ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 2,000 KW PROJECT: Construct power plant. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: Reliable, emergency backup power, for the Hawaii tracking station. This station is the primary satellite communications control station in the Pacific. It must remain operational at all times to communicate to the myriad of satellite systems in geosynchronous and polar orbits. Backup power is required to limit downtime to five and one half minutes per year (99.999 reliability) for mission critical utility loads. New weathertight facility, modern reliable generators, and associated equipment, such as a load bank to test the generators under load, is needed to provide the required standard of reliability. An adequately sized maintenance area is required for major overhauls. Space in the existing power plant, to be available once the new power plant comes on line, is needed to house storage and maintenance functions. CURRENT SITUATION: The satellite tracking station is on Kaena Point, the most westward location on the island of Oahu. It is served by two unreliable commercial feeders. In June of 1991, Kaena Point experienced a brown out and lost commercial power for 36 hours. This site was the last customer brought on line by the commercial power company. The existing emergency power plant (built in 1966 using 1958 vintage generators) is used during inclement weather and for emergency backup. Due to obsolete,					

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION KAENA POINT SATELLITE TRACKING SITE, HAWAII		
4. PROJECT TITLE POWER PLANT	5. PROJECT NUMBER LXHY943024	
<p>manually operated equipment, the site has had 56 total station outages in the past five years with 41 operationally impairing disturbances. The primary electrical distribution system is susceptible to faults which may result in extensive power outages. Existing primary feeders/generators have had several power anomalies, interrupting power to mission critical equipment.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Fluctuations, power outages, and unreliable backup power to critical satellite control equipment will continue to interrupt satellite communications through this critical site in the satellite control network. These interruptions will continue to jeopardize these nonrecoverable, nationally critical, data and communications systems. Control of satellite systems - such as Global Positioning System (GPS), Defense Meteorological Satellite Program (DMSP), and classified mission satellites - is critical to tactical and strategic defense support for all of DOD.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of new construction, revitalization, and status quo operation. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, new construction was found to be the most cost efficient over the life of the project.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION KAENA POINT SATELLITE TRACKING SITE, HAWAII																								
4. PROJECT TITLE POWER PLANT	5. PROJECT NUMBER LXHY943024																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="323 604 1386 730"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 MAY 04</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 AUG 21</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 DEC 16</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="323 793 1386 856"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="323 919 1386 1077"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>450</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>230</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>680</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>565</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>115</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 MAR</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 MAY 04	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 AUG 21	(d) Date Design Complete	93 DEC 16	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	450	(b) All Other Design Costs	230	(c) Total	680	(d) Contract	565	(e) In-house	115
(a) Date Design Started	92 MAY 04																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 AUG 21																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 DEC 16																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	450																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	230																							
(c) Total	680																							
(d) Contract	565																							
(e) In-house	115																							

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)							2. DATE		
AIR FORCE											
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION					4. COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX			
SCOTT AIR FORCE BASE, ILLINOIS					AIR MOBILITY COMMAND			1.05			
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	TOTAL
a. As of 30 SEP 92		2445	4450	2992	197	202	32	130	88	27	10,563
b. End FY 1998		2276	4238	2816	197	202	32	130	88	27	10,006
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (3,282)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)		308,611									
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:		32,710									
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:		7,450									
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)		11,094									
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:		16,850									
g. Remaining Deficiency:		0									
h. Grand Total:		376,715									
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE		SCOPE		COST (\$000)		DESIGN STATUS			
CODE								START		CMPL	
317-311		INTEROPERABILITY TEST AND TRAINING FACILITY		24,300 SF		5,000		AUG 92		APR 93	
422-253		MUNITIONS STORAGE FACILITY/ LAND ACQUISITION (DBOF)		4,900 SF		2,450		SEP 92		DEC 93	
TOTAL:						7,450					
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995)											
411-135		UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS		LS		2,550					
740-884		CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER		22,500 SF		3,500					
811-147		UPGRADE ELECTRICAL DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM		LS		5,044					
TOTAL:						11,094					
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
130-142		FIRE/CRASH RESCUE STATION		11,000 SF		1,750					
141-753		SQUADRON OPERATIONS FACILITY		12,300 SF		1,950					
721-312		ALTER UNACCOMPANIED ENLISTED HSG		225 PN		3,800					
721-312		ALTER UNACCOMPANIED ENLISTED HSG		144 FN		2,950					
822-265		REPAIR STEAM HEATING MAINS		5,000 LF		3,500					
10. Mission or Major Functions: Headquarters United States Transportation Command; Headquarters Air Mobility Command; Tanker/Airlift Control Center; Air Force Communications Command; Air Weather Service; USAF Environmental Technical Applications Center; an airlift wing which performs airlift aeromedical airlift, and training missions (C-9, C-12 and C-21 aircraft); an Air Force Reserve C-9 associate aeromedical airlift group; and a major USAF medical center. Also, a joint military/civil use airfield.											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:		0									
b. Water pollution:		0									
c. Occupational safety and health:		0									
d. Other Environmental:		0									

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION SCOTT AIR FORCE BASE, ILLINOIS		4. PROJECT TITLE INTEROPERABILITY TEST AND TRAINING FACILITY		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 9.12.12S	6. CATEGORY CODE 317-311	7. PROJECT NUMBER VDYD933008	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 5,000	

9. COST ESTIMATES

ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
INTEROPERABILITY TEST AND TRAINING FACILITY	SF	24,300	145	3,524
SUPPORTING FACILITIES				955
COMMUNICATION SUPPORT	LS			(85)
PAVEMENTS	LS			(50)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS	LS			(135)
UTILITIES	LS			(575)
DEMOLITION	SF	22,100	5	(110)
SUBTOTAL				4,479
CONTINGENCY (5%)				224
TOTAL CONTRACT COST				4,703
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)				282
TOTAL REQUEST				4,985
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)				5,000

10. Description of Proposed Construction: Two-story structural steel and masonry building, concrete foundations and pitched or built-up roof. Project includes computer floor in equipment test areas, fixtures, provisions for specialized electronic testing, landscaping, loading dock, sidewalks, paving, and demolition of seven facilities totaling 22,100 square feet.

Air Conditioning: 35 Tons.

11. REQUIREMENT: 24,300 SF ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 0

PROJECT: Construct a communications and computer system interoperability testing and training facility. (Current Mission)

REQUIREMENT: The Air Force needs a facility to combine and house the Technology Integration Center communications-computer system testing and training functions. The Center performs specialized tests to determine whether new equipment is compatible and whether existing equipment continually meets system performance requirements. The testing/training facility must have space for training technicians, space to store high-value test equipment, and safe storage for encryption equipment. It must have a computer-grade grounding, electrical power, and environmental control systems. It also needs to have features such as a loading dock and a raised computer floor so technicians can efficiently and safely set up, test, and remove the equipment.

CURRENT SITUATION: The Center tests equipment already in the DoD inventory and new commercial and Military Specification equipment bought from multiple vendors. Some of the testing supports the new systems being fielded through the Corporate Information Management initiative. The Center performs off-line tests to resolve problems on fielded equipment, tests to confirm the need for equipment upgrades, and performs validation

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION SCOTT AIR FORCE BASE, ILLINOIS		
4. PROJECT TITLE INTEROPERABILITY TEST AND TRAINING FACILITY	5. PROJECT NUMBER VDYD933008	
<p>tests before publishing new Air Force standards. At any time, over \$9 million worth of equipment is undergoing tests. The testing and training functions and their associated professional staffs are housed in separate facilities located approximately three miles apart. Testing is conducted in a wood-framed structure built in 1941. There is no other suitable space available on base. The testing functions overtax the building's obsolete utility systems which fail and require repairs about twice a week. Utility system failures result in downtime and lost production valued at \$112,000 annually. Technicians frequently must work in the asbestos-laden attic to reconfigure wiring during equipment setup and removal. Aisle space is inadequate and in violation of the Life Safety Code.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Cost reductions cannot be realized and inefficiencies will continue. A cost comparison analysis determined that it is not economical to renovate the existing facility to eliminate current deficiencies for its continued use as a test facility. Engineering and testing will be curtailed. New systems will be fielded untested or operating costs will significantly increase if testing must be done in the field. Testing on fielded systems will result in shutdown of operational missions during test periods. The base must continue to commit scarce operations and maintenance resources on the existing testing facility and the seven worn-out facilities.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There are no criteria for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide," or in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements."</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION SCOTT AIR FORCE BASE, ILLINOIS																								
4. PROJECT TITLE INTEROPERABILITY TEST AND TRAINING FACILITY	5. PROJECT NUMBER VDYD933008																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="330 609 1409 745"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 AUG 11</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 OCT 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 APR 01</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="330 798 1409 871"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="330 924 1409 1092"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>306</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>153</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>459</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>306</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>153</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 AUG 11	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 OCT 01	(d) Date Design Complete	93 APR 01	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	306	(b) All Other Design Costs	153	(c) Total	459	(d) Contract	306	(e) In-house	153
(a) Date Design Started	92 AUG 11																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 OCT 01																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 APR 01																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	306																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	153																							
(c) Total	459																							
(d) Contract	306																							
(e) In-house	153																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION SCOTT AIR FORCE BASE, ILLINOIS			4. PROJECT TITLE MUNITIONS STORAGE FACILITY/ LAND ACQUISITION (DBOF)			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 4.18.96		6. CATEGORY CODE 422-253	7. PROJECT NUMBER VDYD923004	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 2,450		
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
MUNITIONS STORAGE FACILITY/ LAND ACQUISITION (DBOF)		LS			1,538	
MULTICUBICLE MAGAZINE STORAGE		SF	4,850	150	(728)	
MUNITIONS HOLDING AREA		SF	400	150	(60)	
MUNITIONS MAINT ADMINISTRATION		SF	1,000	100	(100)	
LAND, FEE PURCHASE		AC	22	19,090	(420)	
LAND, EASEMENT		AC	230	1,000	(230)	
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					480	
UTILITIES		LS			(380)	
PAVEMENTS		LS			(100)	
SUBTOTAL					2,018	
CONTINGENCY (5%)					101	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					2,119	
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					127	
TOTAL REQUEST					2,246	
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					2,450	
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Reinforced concrete foundation and floor slab. Area includes 14 munitions storage bays, fire sprinkler system and a munitions inspection and maintenance facility. Also included are roads, parking fencing, security lighting and alarms and necessary support. Land purchase includes 22 acres and easements include 230 acres.						
11. REQUIREMENT: 6,250 SF ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 410 SF PROJECT: Construct a munitions storage facility and land acquisition. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: Adequate munitions storage and inspection area is required to support training, operational and mobility requirements. Storage magazines must be sized to accommodate the 463L aircraft pallet to meet mobility requirements. Space must be provided to support the security police air base ground defense unit, the explosives ordnance disposal team, HQ AMC combat controllers and mobility missions and training needs of various base organizations. Location should conform to quantity distance criteria for minimum blast and fragmentation distances from inhabited buildings and public roadways. Land purchase consisting of 22 acres is required for construction of munitions storage, munitions maintenance space, and parking area. Easements consisting of 230 acres is required to provide the required buffer zone specified in quantity distance criteria for munitions storage facilities. CURRENT SITUATION: The existing munitions storage/training facility is too small, providing less than ten percent of space required to support base requirements. Lack of space requires munitions to be stored at Little Rock AFB and an Army Depot 50 miles away. During recent DESERT STORM Operations, the 375 CSG Air Base Ground Defense Unit had to deploy without their munitions because munitions were stored at Little Rock. The						

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION SCOTT AIR FORCE BASE, ILLINOIS		
4. PROJECT TITLE MUNITIONS STORAGE FACILITY/ LAND ACQUISITION (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER VDYD923004	
<p>existing location does not meet quantity distance criteria for minimum blast and fragmentation distances to inhabited buildings (1,250 feet; nearest building is 250 feet) and public traffic routes (750 feet; nearest road is 100 feet). There is no available space on base on which to construct this facility. Therefore, land must be purchased as part of this project.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Mission requirements for training, mobility and operations will be severely impacted by depending on other installations, distant from the base, for munitions storage.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements". Project has been considered for FY97 force structure end strength.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																																													
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION SCOTT AIR FORCE BASE, ILLINOIS																																															
4. PROJECT TITLE MUNITIONS STORAGE FACILITY/ LAND ACQUISITION (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER VDYD923004																																														
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td colspan="3">(1) Status:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td></td> <td>92 SEP 30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td></td> <td>15%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td></td> <td>93 AUG 16</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td></td> <td>93 DEC 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(2) Basis:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td></td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td></td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td></td> <td>123</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td></td> <td>123</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> <td>123</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(4) Construction Start</td> <td></td> <td>94 JAN</td> </tr> </table> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(1) Status:			(a) Date Design Started		92 SEP 30	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		15%	(c) Date 35% Designed		93 AUG 16	(d) Date Design Complete		93 DEC 15	(2) Basis:			(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A	(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)			(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		123	(b) All Other Design Costs			(c) Total		123	(d) Contract		123	(e) In-house			(4) Construction Start		94 JAN
(1) Status:																																															
(a) Date Design Started		92 SEP 30																																													
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		15%																																													
(c) Date 35% Designed		93 AUG 16																																													
(d) Date Design Complete		93 DEC 15																																													
(2) Basis:																																															
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO																																													
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A																																													
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)																																															
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		123																																													
(b) All Other Design Costs																																															
(c) Total		123																																													
(d) Contract		123																																													
(e) In-house																																															
(4) Construction Start		94 JAN																																													

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)								2. DATE	
AIR FORCE											
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION						4. COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX		
MCCONNELL AIR FORCE BASE, KANSAS						AIR COMBAT COMMAND			0.92		
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			TOTAL
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	
a. As of 30 SEP 92		375	2687	360		88					3,510
b. End FY 1998		343	2357	351		88					3,139
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (3,103)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)										273,073	
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:										19,910	
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:										1,900	
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)										11,100	
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:										28,100	
g. Remaining Deficiency:										0	
h. Grand Total:										334,083	
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY						COST		DESIGN STATUS			
<u>CODE</u>		<u>PROJECT TITLE</u>				<u>SCOPE</u>		<u>(\$000)</u>		<u>START</u> <u>CMPL</u>	
149-962		CONTROL TOWER CAB				1 EA		900		SEP 92 APR 93	
921-167		LAND RESTRICTIVE EASEMENT ACQUISITION				149 AC		1,000		SEP 92 MAY 93	
						TOTAL:		1,900			
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995)											
124-000		UPGRADE POL DIKES AND BASINS				LS		1,050			
610-000		BASE ENGINEERING COMPLEX				46,250 SF		4,650			
610-121		TRANSPORTATION COMPLEX				15,600 SF		2,550			
831-157		GLYCOL RECOVERY SYSTEM				1 EA		1,150			
871-183		STORM DRAINAGE FACILITIES				LS		1,700			
						TOTAL:		11,100			
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
111-111		UPGRADE RUNWAY				LS		3,100			
121-000		AIRCRAFT DISPENSING				4,850 SF		1,600			
610-128		MILITARY PERSONNEL SUPPORT CENTER				48,250 SF		6,400			
690-000		PROCUREMENT FACILITY				8,000 SF		1,400			
740-884		ADD TO AND ALTER CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER				27,300 SF		2,600			
10. Mission or Major Functions: A bomb wing which includes one B-1 squadron; an Air Mobility Command air refueling squadron (KC-135 aircraft); and an Air National Guard fighter group (F-16 aircraft).											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:										0	
b. Water pollution:										2,550	
c. Occupational safety and health:										0	
d. Other Environmental:										0	

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)								2. DATE	
AIR FORCE											
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION					4. COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX			
BARKSDALE AIR FORCE BASE, LOUISIANA					AIR COMBAT COMMAND			0.86			
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			TOTAL
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	
a. As of 30 SEP 92		907	4789	1092		509		1	6		7,304
b. End FY 1998		822	4507	1265		509		1	6		7,110
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (22,382)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92) 205,446											
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory: 43,340											
d. Authorization Requested In This Program: 2,560											
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995) 13,500											
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years: 36,650											
g. Remaining Deficiency: 0											
h. Grand Total: 301,496											
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE		SCOPE		COST (\$000)		DESIGN STATUS			
CODE								START		Cmpl	
124-000		UPGRADE BULK STORAGE BASINS		LS		1,600		AUG 92		AUG 93	
872-247		WEAPONS STORAGE AREA SECURITY		LS		960		JUL 92		JUN 93	
						TOTAL:		2,560			
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995)											
121-122		ADD TO AND ALTER APRON/HYDRANT FUELING SYSTEM, PHASE II		LS		12,000					
871-183		STORM DRAINAGE FACILITIES		LS		1,500					
						TOTAL:		13,500			
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
121-122		UPGRADE HYDRANT FUELING SYSTEM		LS		12,000					
121-122		HYDRANT FUELING SYSTEM		LS		12,000					
171-712		ADD TO AND ALTER TARGET INTELLIGENCE TRAINING		14,000 SF		900					
442-758		AIRCRAFT PARTS STORE		75,000 SF		6,000					
740-674		PHYSICAL FITNESS CENTER		18,200 SF		2,450					
10. Mission or Major Functions: Headquarters Eighth Air Force; a flying wing which includes two bombardment squadrons (B-52 aircraft) and one air refueling squadron (KC-135 aircraft); Air Mobility Command operations group (two air refueling squadrons of KC-10 aircraft) and airlift detachment (C-21 aircraft); and an Air Force Reserve fighter wing (A-10 and OA-10 aircraft) and KC-10 associate air refueling group.											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:										0	
b. Water pollution:										5,800	
c. Occupational safety and health:										0	
d. Other Environmental:										0	

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE			
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION BARKSDALE AIR FORCE BASE, LOUISIANA				4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE BULK STORAGE BASINS				
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 1.18.56		6. CATEGORY CODE 124-000	7. PROJECT NUMBER AWUB910027		8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 1,600			
9. COST ESTIMATES								
ITEM					U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
UPGRADE BULK STORAGE BASINS					SY	38,000	20	760
SUPPORTING FACILITIES								600
UTILITIES					LS			(85)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS					LS			(275)
PAVEMENTS					SY	10,000	20	(200)
DEMOLISH PAVEMENT					SY	38,100	1	(40)
SUBTOTAL								1,360
CONTINGENCY (10%)								136
TOTAL CONTRACT COST								1,496
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)								90
TOTAL REQUEST								1,586
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)								1,600
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Install adequate drainage system to drain rainwater from bermed basin area. Upgrade existing containment berms and install an impervious concrete liner over berms and basins.								
11. REQUIREMENT: As required. <u>PROJECT</u> : Upgrade bulk storage basins. (Current Mission) <u>REQUIREMENT</u> : This is a Level 1 environmental compliance requirement. In accordance with Federal Law (40 CFR 112.7), all bulk fuel storage tanks require an impervious liner to protect soil and water from contamination due to tank leakage. <u>CURRENT SITUATION</u> : The base is in violation of Federal Law requiring impervious liners for bulk fuel storage areas. The current spill containment berms/basins have deteriorated and do not provide an effective impervious liner to stop a jet fuel spill from soaking into the soil. The current rainwater drainage system is also totally inadequate as it fails to prevent contamination of storm drainage systems. <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED</u> : The base will remain in violation of Federal Law and may begin receiving Notices of Violation, fines, and significant adverse publicity for failure to protect the health and welfare of people and the environment. Accidental fuel spill and contamination of soil and water (surface and ground) would result in a threat to human health and extremely costly cleanup measures. Continued violation of the law could result in directed cessation of aircraft refueling activities which would eliminate further flying operations at the base. Mission execution would not be possible. <u>ADDITIONAL</u> : There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However,								

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION BARKSDALE AIR FORCE BASE, LOUISIANA		
4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE BULK STORAGE BASINS	5. PROJECT NUMBER AWUB910027	
<p>this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements".</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																							
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION BARKSDALE AIR FORCE BASE, LOUISIANA																									
4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE BULK STORAGE BASINS	5. PROJECT NUMBER AWUB910027																								
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="344 612 1386 755"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 AUG 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 SEP 30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 AUG 15</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <p>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</p> <p>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</p> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e):</p> <table data-bbox="344 904 1386 1095"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>96</td> <td>(\$000)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>54</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>150</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>110</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>40</td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start</p> <p>94 FEB</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 AUG 01	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 SEP 30	(d) Date Design Complete	93 AUG 15	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	96	(\$000)	(b) All Other Design Costs	54		(c) Total	150		(d) Contract	110		(e) In-house	40	
(a) Date Design Started	92 AUG 01																								
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																								
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 SEP 30																								
(d) Date Design Complete	93 AUG 15																								
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	96	(\$000)																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	54																								
(c) Total	150																								
(d) Contract	110																								
(e) In-house	40																								

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)							2. DATE		
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ANDREWS AIR FORCE BASE, MARYLAND					4. COMMAND AIR MOBILITY COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX 1.05			
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			TOTAL
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	
a. As of 30 SEP 92		1136	4110	1773	159	142	15	122	1156	164	8,777
b. End FY 1998		1104	3995	1734	159	142	15	122	1156	164	8,591
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (7,488)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)		372,964									
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:		26,020									
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:		17,990									
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)		3,810									
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:		67,540									
g. Remaining Deficiency:		0									
h. Grand Total:		488,324									
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE		SCOPE		COST (\$000)		DESIGN STATUS			
CODE								START		CMLP	
141-782		AIR FREIGHT TERMINAL		38,600 SF		4,400		SEP 92		SEP 93	
179-511		FIRE TRAINING FACILITY (DBOF)				LS 1,000		OCT 92		OCT 93	
610-000		UPGRADE COMPOSITE ADMINISTRATION FACILITY (DBOF)		347,500 SF		9,940		APR 93		MAR 94	
832-266		UPGRADE SANITARY SEWER SYSTEMS				LS 2,650		SEP 92		JUL 93	
				TOTAL:		17,990					
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995)											
740-884		CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER		23,000 SF		3,810					
				TOTAL:		3,810					
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
121-122		REPLACE HYDRANT REFUELING SYSTEMS				LS 9,790					
218-712		ACFT SPRT EQUIP SHOP/STORAGE		13,900 SF		2,450					
219-944		ADD TO AND ALTER BASE ENGINEER ADMINISTRATION		45,800 SF		7,600					
411-135		IMPROVE JET FUEL STORAGE				LS 5,900					
721-312		DORMITORY		270 PN		7,400					
10. Mission or Major Functions: An air lift wing which performs Presidential support & special air missions (C-9, C-12, C-20, C-137, VC-25 aircraft, & UH-1 helicopters); an airlift squadron with C-12 & C-21 aircraft; an AFRES airlift wing (C-141's); an ANG fighter wing (F-16's) and airlift squadron (C-21's & C-22's); ANG Readiness Center; HQ District of Columbia ANG; Air Force Materiel Command test wing detachment (C-135 aircraft); and a major USAF medical center. Major tenants include Army, Navy, and Marine Corps flying units.											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:		0									
b. Water pollution:		0									
c. Occupational safety and health:		0									
d. Other Environmental:		18,400									

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)		2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ANDREWS AIR FORCE BASE, MARYLAND			4. PROJECT TITLE AIR FREIGHT TERMINAL (DBOF)		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 4.18.96	6. CATEGORY CODE 141-782	7. PROJECT NUMBER AJXF923002	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 4,400		

9. COST ESTIMATES				
ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
AIR FREIGHT TERMINAL (DBOF)	LS			3,286
AIR FREIGHT TERMINAL	SF	33,800	83	(2,805)
ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE	SF	4,800	92	(442)
AIR FREIGHT PAVED STORAGE	SY	1,700	23	(39)
SUPPORTING FACILITIES				675
UTILITIES	LS			(290)
PAVEMENTS	LS			(290)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS	LS			(95)
SUBTOTAL				3,961
CONTINGENCY (5%)				198
TOTAL CONTRACT COST				4,159
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)				250
TOTAL REQUEST				4,409
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)				4,400

10. Description of Proposed Construction: Reinforced concrete footings, foundation and floor slab, structural steel frame, insulated walls and roof, fire protection system, and utilities. Area includes space for covered pallet-train buildup, packing and crating, administration and necessary support.

11. REQUIREMENT: 38,600 SF ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 18,700 SF
PROJECT: Construct an air freight terminal. (Current Mission)
REQUIREMENT: Adequate facilities for conveyable and non-conveyable cargo, pallet buildup and netting, aircraft pallet storage, special cargo processing and storage, packing and crating and freight management. Facility will be configured to accommodate modern mechanized handling equipment.
CURRENT SITUATION: Air freight operations are currently accomplished in an aircraft maintenance hangar which provides only 50 percent of the required space. Inefficiencies include lack of off-load docks, packing and crating area, outdated, inefficient material handling equipment and inadequate security for sensitive cargo. Cargo is processed to support State Department, embassy flights, foreign governments and special high visibility flights. Much of this cargo requires a secure storage area which can only be achieved by posting security police to guard the cargo until it can be processed for shipping. Aircraft pallet storage located outside offers no protection from the elements. When vacated, the space (18,700 SF) will be converted back to hangar space and thereby reduce the 64,000 SF hangar space deficiency at Andrews. Remaining hangar space deficiency will be satisfied in future MILCON program.
IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: Air freight operations will continue to be performed in a substandard facility which results in reduced productivity

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ANDREWS AIR FORCE BASE, MARYLAND		
4. PROJECT TITLE AIR FREIGHT TERMINAL (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER AJXF923002	
<p>and low worker morale.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL</u>: There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements". A life-cycle economic analysis has been performed comparing all reasonable options for accomplishing this project (status quo, contracting out services, renovation and new construction). This analysis indicates the new construction alternative is the most economical. Project has been considered for FY97 force structure end strength.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ANDREWS AIR FORCE BASE, MARYLAND																								
4. PROJECT TITLE AIR FREIGHT TERMINAL (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER AJXF923002																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="327 604 1379 737"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 SEP 17</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 OCT 29</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 SEP 27</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="327 800 1379 863"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="327 926 1379 1083"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>225</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>138</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>363</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>326</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>37</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 SEP 17	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 OCT 29	(d) Date Design Complete	93 SEP 27	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	225	(b) All Other Design Costs	138	(c) Total	363	(d) Contract	326	(e) In-house	37
(a) Date Design Started	92 SEP 17																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 OCT 29																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 SEP 27																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	225																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	138																							
(c) Total	363																							
(d) Contract	326																							
(e) In-house	37																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)		2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ANDREWS AIR FORCE BASE, MARYLAND			4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE COMPOSITE ADMINISTRATION FACILITY (DBOF)		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 9.12.12S	6. CATEGORY CODE 610-000	7. PROJECT NUMBER AJXF943010	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 9,940		
9. COST ESTIMATES					
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
UPGRADE COMPOSITE ADMINISTRATION FACILITY (DBOF)		SF	347,500	7	2,433
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					6,050
HVAC		LS			(3,600)
DEMOLITION		SF	215,000	5	(1,075)
COMMUNICATIONS		LS			(875)
SYSTEMS FURNITURE		LS			(500)
SUBTOTAL					8,483
CONTINGENCY (10%)					848
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					9,331
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6.5%)					607
TOTAL REQUEST					9,938
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					9,940
EQUIPMENT FROM OTHER APPROPRIATIONS (NON-ADD)					(650)
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Structural, mechanical and electrical upgrade required to accommodate new occupants.					
11. REQUIREMENT: 672,931 SF ADEQUATE: 341,944 SF SUBSTANDARD: 190,087 SF PROJECT: Upgrade composite administration building and inadequate utility systems for new occupancy following relocation/integration of Air Force Systems Command into new command. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: Improve existing facility to support complete change in occupancy. New occupants will move into the facility from substandard facilities on Andrews and from other installations. Demolition of 10 substandard facilities totalling 65 KSF and a Bolling AFB 119.8 KSF facility is included in this project. An additional 7 facilities totalling 31 KSF will be temporarily reused to relieve a space shortage in the Air National Guard Bureau (ANGB) HQ and demolished during FY95 MILCON construction of a new ANGB facility. Total space reductions achieved through this project are demolition of 215 KSF of substandard facilities. This project supports facility consolidation and reduction initiatives. This facility will provide a centralized customer service center for base civilian and military personnel, finance, pass and identification, legal, claim services, transportation management office and scheduled airlines ticket office. It will also become the new headquarters for HQ/AFOSI. CURRENT SITUATION: Combining Air Force Systems Command and Air Force Logistics Command into Air Force Materiel Command at Wright-Patterson AFB leaves bldg 1535 at Andrews AFB available for complete change of occupancy. Administrative occupants from Andrews and from the National Capital Region (NCR) will move into existing offices. HQ/AFOSI's current facility suffers from severe termite damage precluding the addition of					

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ANDREWS AIR FORCE BASE, MARYLAND		
4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE COMPOSITE ADMINISTRATION FACILITY (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER AJXF943010	
<p>safes and the updating of computer systems, in addition to causing a safety hazard. To date, the 89 AW and 89 SPTG staff have moved in with portions of finance, manpower, 89 AW Judge Advocate, 89 AW Community Support, CBPO, Civilian Personnel and Traffic Management. The functions which can move without construction have moved. The major components of the heating system are original from 1946 construction of the building, and the air conditioning system is 1964 construction. The main chillers and air handling units are no longer available, and the system is overtaxed because the loads in the building have gradually increased over the years. Air handling units are undersized for the building configuration and loads and wall mounted fan coil units are ineffective for open office areas. Current substandard facilities require inordinate amounts of utilities, maintenance and repair. Parts are not available to repair obsolete systems, requiring extra effort in manufacturing or altering substitutes.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> If upgrades are not accomplished building tenants will be forced to occupy substandard spaces. HQ AFOSI will not be able to meet expanding mission requirements levied by DOD, HQ USAF, and the NCA because of the structural limitations of their current facility. In addition, the condition of facility systems, including HVAC, lighting, electrical, and security will continue to degrade, increasing the drain on scarce O&M resources. System outages impact the ability of occupants to perform their missions.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> This project will result in the vacating of facilities on the following government properties: Washington Navy Yard (1,100 SF), Bolling AFB (98,500 SF) and Fort Belvoir (19,652 SF). Initial beddown requirements (excluding HQ AFOSI) were met under O&M renovation project AJXF921586, Renovate Base Headquarters. The primary justification for this project is consolidation and reduction of space. An economic analysis has been performed which supports this project as the most economical alternative to provide adequate facilities.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ANDREWS AIR FORCE BASE, MARYLAND			
4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE COMPOSITE ADMINISTRATION FACILITY (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER AJXF943010		
12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:			
a. Estimated Design Data:			
(1) Status:			
(a) Date Design Started		93 APR 20	
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		2%	
(c) Date 35% Designed		93 OCT 01	
(d) Date Design Complete		94 MAR 10	
(2) Basis:			
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO	
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A	
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)			
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		483	
(b) All Other Design Costs		322	
(c) Total		805	
(d) Contract		478	
(e) In-house		327	
(4) Construction Start		94 MAY	
b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations:			
EQUIPMENT NOMENCLATURE	PROCURING APPROPRIATION	FISCAL YEAR APPROPRIATED OR REQUESTED	COST (\$000)
OFFICE EQUIPMENT	3080	93	650

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)		2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ANDREWS AIR FORCE BASE, MARYLAND		4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE SANITARY SEWER SYSTEMS	
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 4.18.56	6. CATEGORY CODE 832-266	7. PROJECT NUMBER AJXF913002	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 2,650

9. COST ESTIMATES				
ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
UPGRADE SANITARY SEWER SYSTEMS	LF	27,700		1,822
UPGRADE SANITARY SEWER SYSTEM	LF	12,700	49	(622)
REPLACE SANITARY SEWER SYSTEM	LF	15,000	80	(1,200)
SUPPORTING FACILITIES				450
SITE IMPROVEMENTS/DEMOLITION	LS			(450)
SUBTOTAL				2,272
CONTINGENCY (10%)				227
TOTAL CONTRACT COST				2,499
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)				150
TOTAL REQUEST				2,649
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)				2,650

10. Description of Proposed Construction: Upgrade or replace sanitary sewer mains. Work includes installing protective linings, replacing existing pipe, demolition and necessary support.

11. REQUIREMENT: As required.

PROJECT: Upgrade sanitary sewer systems. (Current Mission)

REQUIREMENT: This is a Level II environmental compliance project, required to upgrade the existing cast iron piping system with an environmentally compatible piping system. Included is the removal of 17 industrial pump stations and 16 interceptors and converting portions of the sewage system to gravity feed. These improvements are required to bring the sewage system into compliance with State of Maryland regulatory laws contained in COMAR 26.08.04.

CURRENT SITUATION: Portions of the west and east side sewer systems are poorly configured with a maze of subsystems which prevent an efficient flow pattern. The system has developed numerous failures resulting in sewage flow into the ground. The base is located between the water sheds of the Potomac River and the Patuxent River. This places the base at high risk to pollute the waterways leading into the Chesapeake Bay. The State of Maryland has inspected the sewage system and is presently debating whether or not to renew the base's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit because of the systems deteriorated condition.

IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: The sanitary sewer system will continue to deteriorate, thus increasing the amount of sewage flow into the ground. This will expose the Air Force and DOD to adverse publicity and possible fines.

ADDITIONAL: There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ANDREWS AIR FORCE BASE, MARYLAND		
4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE SANITARY SEWER SYSTEMS	5. PROJECT NUMBER AJXF913002	
<p>Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements". A preliminary analysis of reasonable options for accomplishing this project (status quo, renovation, and new construction) was done. It indicates there is only one option that satisfies regulatory requirements. Because of this, a full economic analysis was not performed. A certificate of exception has been prepared. Project has been considered for FY97 force structure end strength.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ANDREWS AIR FORCE BASE, MARYLAND																								
4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE SANITARY SEWER SYSTEMS	5. PROJECT NUMBER AJXF913002																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="327 604 1400 737"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 SEP 25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 NOV 12</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 JUL 09</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="327 793 1400 863"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="327 919 1400 1083"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>145</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>106</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>251</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>221</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>30</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 SEP 25	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 NOV 12	(d) Date Design Complete	93 JUL 09	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	145	(b) All Other Design Costs	106	(c) Total	251	(d) Contract	221	(e) In-house	30
(a) Date Design Started	92 SEP 25																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 NOV 12																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 JUL 09																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	145																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	106																							
(c) Total	251																							
(d) Contract	221																							
(e) In-house	30																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)							2. DATE		
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION FORT GEORGE G MEADE, MARYLAND					4. COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX 1.05		
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH	PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			TOTAL
	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	
a. As of 30 SEP 92										
b. End FY 1998										
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)										
a. Total Acreage: (0)									
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)										0
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:										0
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:										1,450
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)										0
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:										0
g. Remaining Deficiency:										0
h. Grand Total:										1,450
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994										
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE		SCOPE		COST (\$000)		DESIGN STATUS		
CODE								START	CMPL	
141-456	ADD TO OPERATIONS FACILITY			7,000 SF		1,450		JUL 92	AUG 93	
						TOTAL:		1,450		
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995) NONE										
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:										
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:										
a. Air pollution:									0	
b. Water pollution:									0	
c. Occupational safety and health:									0	
d. Other Environmental:									0	

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION FORT GEORGE G. MEADE, MARYLAND			4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO OPERATIONS FACILITY			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 2.80.19 TIARA		6. CATEGORY CODE 141-456	7. PROJECT NUMBER PAYZ935057	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 1,450		
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
ADD TO OPERATIONS FACILITY		SF	7,000	120	840	
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					470	
UTILITIES		LS			(350)	
PAVEMENTS		LS			(120)	
SUBTOTAL					1,310	
CONTINGENCY (5%)					66	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					1,376	
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					83	
TOTAL REQUEST					1,459	
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					1,450	
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Construct a structural metal building with concrete slab and exterior parking area to house maintenance area, logistics maintenance, storage, mobility equipment, war readiness support kits and operations space for SENIOR SCOUT airborne. Addition to provide high bays for drive-thru capability. Air Conditioning: 20 Tons.						
11. REQUIREMENT: 18,700 SF ADEQUATE: 11,700 SF SUBSTANDARD: 0 PROJECT: Construct a 7,000 square foot sensitive compartmented information facility (SCIF) addition to house three SENIOR SCOUT Vans. (New Mission) REQUIREMENT: The operations support SCIF is used to maintain, operate and store vans which house sophisticated mission computer equipment. Two vans currently are fully operational and on location; a third system is scheduled to arrive in early 1994. These systems are rapidly deployable mission vans which are loaded on tactical aircraft to provide flexible, tailored responses to tactical commanders. Space also is needed for required war readiness support kits and sensitive supplies. CURRENT SITUATION: The existing facility is barely adequate for one system. The original building was designed for 35-foot long vans; however, 40-foot long vans were delivered. This has caused extremely cramped areas for maintenance operations when both vans are in-garrison. Drive-thru capability does not exist, and considerable time is spent jockeying vans into the maintenance areas. In addition, operations, logistics maintenance, and supply spaces now are overcrowded, and space is not available to support additional systems. The facility is located in the National Security Agency exclusive use area at Ft George G. Meade and is not part of the planned base closure action.						

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION FORT GEORGE G. MEADE, MARYLAND		
4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO OPERATIONS FACILITY	5. PROJECT NUMBER PAYZ935057	
<p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Additional vans would be stored outside and left uncovered. These vans are not designed to be exposed to environmental elements and must be housed on an aircraft or within an enclosed facility. Temporary outside storage would require complete coverage by tarps or canvas, and additional temporary air conditioning systems and electrical power connections would be required. This will greatly hamper required maintenance and operational testing and jeopardize mission readiness.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There are no criteria for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide," or in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements."</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION FORT GEORGE G. MEADE, MARYLAND																								
4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO OPERATIONS FACILITY	5. PROJECT NUMBER PAYZ935057																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="310 604 1384 737"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 JUL 29</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 OCT 14</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 AUG 17</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="310 793 1384 863"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="310 919 1384 1083"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>87</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>100</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>187</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>115</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>72</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 JAN</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 JUL 29	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 OCT 14	(d) Date Design Complete	93 AUG 17	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	87	(b) All Other Design Costs	100	(c) Total	187	(d) Contract	115	(e) In-house	72
(a) Date Design Started	92 JUL 29																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 OCT 14																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 AUG 17																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	87																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	100																							
(c) Total	187																							
(d) Contract	115																							
(e) In-house	72																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)							2. DATE			
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION COLUMBUS AIR FORCE BASE, MISSISSIPPI					4. COMMAND AIR TRAINING COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX 0.82			
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			TOTAL
	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV		
a. As of 30 SEP 92		378	789	318	205						1,690
b. End FY 1998		394	738	329	227						1,688
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (6,015)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)											115,855
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:											3,100
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:											2,900
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)											4,650
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:											14,500
g. Remaining Deficiency:											0
h. Grand Total:											141,005
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE				SCOPE		COST	DESIGN STATUS		
CODE							(\$000)	START	Cmpl		
136-664	UPGRADE AIRFIELD LIGHTING				60,000 LF		2,900	JUL 91	AUG 93		
							TOTAL:	2,900			
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995)											
211-179	FUEL SYSTEMS MAINTENANCE DOCK				9,900 SF		1,550				
442-000	T-1 SPECIALIZED UPT MAINTENANCE SUPPORT				LS		3,100				
							TOTAL:	4,650			
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
134-375	RAPCON CENTER				15,600 SF		2,400				
149-962	CONTROL TOWER				1 EA		2,600				
211-153	NONDESTRUCTIVE INSPECTION FACILITY				5,400 SF		1,400				
211-177	SMALL ACFT MAINTENANCE DOCK				32,700 SF		3,100				
831-165	WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT				2 MG		5,000				
10. Mission or Major Functions: A flying training wing which conducts Undergraduate Pilot Training (UPT) with one T-37 squadron and one T-38 squadron. Also, base will undergo a T-37 to T-1 aircraft conversion.											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:											0
b. Water pollution:											5,350
c. Occupational safety and health:											0
d. Other Environmental:											350

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)		2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION COLUMBUS AIR FORCE BASE, MISSISSIPPI			4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE AIRFIELD LIGHTING		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 8.57.96T	6. CATEGORY CODE 136-664	7. PROJECT NUMBER EEPZ933000	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 2,900		
9. COST ESTIMATES					
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
UPGRADE AIRFIELD LIGHTING		LF	54,500		626
RUNWAY LIGHTING 13L/31R		LF	8,000	16	(128)
RUNWAY LIGHTING 13C/31C		LF	12,000	6	(72)
RUNWAY LIGHTING 13R/31L		LF	6,300	14	(88)
TAXIWAY LIGHTING		LF	28,200	12	(338)
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					1,825
DISTANCE MARKERS/WIND CONES		LS			(305)
THRESHOLD LIGHTING		LS			(1,005)
ALSF-1 APPROACH LIGHTING-CENTER RW		LS			(345)
VISUAL GLIDESLOPE INDICATOR		LS			(170)
SUBTOTAL					2,451
CONTINGENCY (10%)					245
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					2,696
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					162
TOTAL REQUEST					2,858
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					2,900
10. Description of Proposed Construction: New high intensity threshold, pre-threshold and terminating bar lights, new north approach lighting system with sequenced flashers (ALSF-1), new lighting cable and isolation transformers, new distance markers and illuminated wind cones, new precision approach path indicator (PAPI) lights, new cables on runways 13R/31L, 13C/31C, and 13L/31R, taxiways and SAC apron.					
11. REQUIREMENT: As required. PROJECT: Upgrade airfield lighting. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: This project is required to properly modify, upgrade and standardize existing visual navigational aid facilities to FAA and Air Force standards. This will improve operational safety, reliability and efficiency of the airfield through the use of equipment, fixtures and materials that can be adequately maintained. This lighting upgrade was identified in the 1988 Air Training Command Master Planning Study of Airfield Lighting Systems at Columbus AFB and is required for the proper training and safety of inexperienced student pilots. CURRENT SITUATION: Inexperienced student pilots fly 240 sorties per day to comply with the strict flying syllabus. Worst airfield lighting system in ATC as determined by ATC engineering analysis. Base experienced 20 major outages in 1991, one resulting in a two week downtime. Threshold lighting does not provide high intensity lighting required by Air Force directives. Antiquated glide slope indicators and other light equipment are difficult and expensive to maintain. The existing cables have excessive current losses associated with advanced stages of insulation deterioration. IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: Airfield will be non-operational during inclement weather/night flying. Student pilots will not meet curriculum schedules					

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION COLUMBUS AIR FORCE BASE, MISSISSIPPI		
4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE AIRFIELD LIGHTING	5. PROJECT NUMBER EEPZ933000	
<p>when night flying is stopped.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> An economic analysis was not prepared because this project directly supports a mission function for which there is no available alternative but to upgrade the airfield lighting. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements".</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION COLUMBUS AIR FORCE BASE. MISSISSIPPI																								
4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE AIRFIELD LIGHTING	5. PROJECT NUMBER EEPZ933000																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>91 JUL 08</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>91 NOV 26</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 AUG 20</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>180</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>205</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>205</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	91 JUL 08	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	50%	(c) Date 35% Designed	91 NOV 26	(d) Date Design Complete	93 AUG 20	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	180	(b) All Other Design Costs	25	(c) Total	205	(d) Contract		(e) In-house	205
(a) Date Design Started	91 JUL 08																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	50%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	91 NOV 26																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 AUG 20																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	180																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	25																							
(c) Total	205																							
(d) Contract																								
(e) In-house	205																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)						2. DATE			
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION KEESLER AIR FORCE BASE, MISSISSIPPI				4. COMMAND AIR TRAINING COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX 0.84				
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	TOTAL
a. As of 30 SEP 92		1039	4060	2021	157	2900	77	28	62		10,344
b. End FY 1998		1036	4322	2294	301	2868	18	48	1352	6	12,245
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (3,546)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)		267,157									
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:		9,750									
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:		8,710									
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)		13,550									
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:		18,700									
g. Remaining Deficiency:		0									
h. Grand Total:		317,867									
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE				SCOPE		COST (\$000)		DESIGN STATUS	
CODE										START CMPL	
179-511		FIRE TRAINING FACILITY				1 EA		690		AUG 92 AUG 93	
411-135		UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS				21 EA		600		AUG 92 JUL 93	
721-312		UPGRADE STUDENT DORMITORY				483 PN		4,500		JUN 92 NOV 93	
832-266		UPGRADE SANITARY SEWER SYSTEM				418,000 LF		2,920		SEP 92 DEC 93	
		TOTAL:						8,710			
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995)											
171-621		7-LEVEL TRAINING CLASSROOMS				11,400 SF		1,800			
721-315		7-LEVEL TRAINING DORMITORY				89,000 SF		8,800			
812-224		UPGRADE ELECTRICAL SYSTEM				LS		2,950			
		TOTAL:						13,550			
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
721-312		REPLACE DORMITORY AND DINING FACILITY				500 PN		4,700			
721-312		STUDENT DORMITORY				500 PN		4,800			
740-674		PHYSICAL FITNESS CENTER				28,500 SF		4,900			
824-464		UPGRADE BASE GAS SYSTEM				LS		4,300			
10. Mission or Major Functions: Training center for avionics, communications, electronics, radar systems, computer and command-and-control systems, personnel, and administrative courses; an Air Force Reserve airlift wing (C-130 and WC-130 aircraft); an Air Combat Command airborne command and control squadron (EC-130 aircraft); and a major Air Force medical center.											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:		0									
b. Water pollution:		0									
c. Occupational safety and health:		0									
d. Other Environmental:		0									

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE			
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION KEESLER AIR FORCE BASE, MISSISSIPPI				4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE STUDENT DORMITORY				
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 8.57.96T		6. CATEGORY CODE 721-312	7. PROJECT NUMBER MAHG933000		8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 4,500			
9. COST ESTIMATES								
ITEM					U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
UPGRADE STUDENT DORMITORY					SF	137,500	22	3,025
SUPPORTING FACILITIES								820
UTILITIES					LS			(50)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS					LS			(40)
ASBESTOS REMOVAL					LS			(730)
SUBTOTAL								3,845
CONTINGENCY (10%)								385
TOTAL CONTRACT COST								4,230
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)								254
TOTAL REQUEST								4,484
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)								4,500
10. Description of Proposed Construction: All work necessary to renovate one enlisted student dormitory. Remove asbestos materials; upgrade all latrines; replace the HVAC system and roof; upgrade electric service and distribution; install new ceiling and lights; replace all windows, doors, and frames; install gypsum board wall surfaces, new floor covering, hurricane panels and other features as required. Air Conditioning: 350 Tons. Grade Mix: 500 E1-E4.								
11. REQUIREMENT: 5,630 PN ADEQUATE: 2,420 PN SUBSTANDARD: 4,407 PN <u>PROJECT:</u> Upgrade student dormitory. (Current Mission) <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> A major Air Force objective is to provide unaccompanied enlisted personnel with housing conducive to their proper rest, relaxation and personal well-being. Adequate on-base living quarters are required to accommodate enlisted students preparing for highly technical career fields to ensure that an environment conducive to studying is available. Properly designed and finished quarters are essential to meet the housing needs of all students. <u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> The existing dormitory, which is far below Air Force Standards, was constructed in 1953. Common latrines, inadequate lighting, poor insulation and sound attenuation, obsolete electrical and mechanical systems, settled floors and foundation problems are major deficiencies in this facility. Upgrade is required to extend the life of the facility an additional 25 years and provide adequate living conditions for students. Project will not change the interior configuration of common latrines. <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> The student dormitory will remain substandard and will require increasingly larger investments of scarce operations and maintenance resources. Substandard living conditions will continue to be a major quality of life issue.								

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION KEESLER AIR FORCE BASE, MISSISSIPPI		
4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE STUDENT DORMITORY	5. PROJECT NUMBER MAHG933000	
<p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of new construction, revitalization, leasing and status quo operation. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, revitalization was found to be the most cost effective over the life of the project. This project meets the criteria/scope specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide".</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION KEESLER AIR FORCE BASE, MISSISSIPPI																								
4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE STUDENT DORMITORY	5. PROJECT NUMBER MAHG933000																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 JUN 30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 SEP 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 NOV 30</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>YES</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>KEESLER</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>275</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>45</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>320</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>242</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>78</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 FEB</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 JUN 30	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 SEP 15	(d) Date Design Complete	93 NOV 30	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	YES	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	KEESLER	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	275	(b) All Other Design Costs	45	(c) Total	320	(d) Contract	242	(e) In-house	78
(a) Date Design Started	92 JUN 30																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 SEP 15																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 NOV 30																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	YES																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	KEESLER																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	275																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	45																							
(c) Total	320																							
(d) Contract	242																							
(e) In-house	78																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION KEESLER AIR FORCE BASE, MISSISSIPPI			4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE SANITARY SEWER SYSTEM			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 8.57.56T	6. CATEGORY CODE 832-266	7. PROJECT NUMBER MAHG943010	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 2,920			
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
UPGRADE SANITARY SEWER SYSTEM		LS			1,950	
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					515	
UTILITIES		LS			(5)	
PAVEMENTS		LS			(5)	
REMEDIATION OF CONTAMINATION		LS			(505)	
SUBTOTAL					2,465	
CONTINGENCY (10%)					247	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					2,712	
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6.5%)					176	
TOTAL REQUEST					2,888	
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					2,920	
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Perform all work to upgrade the existing sanitary sewer system and remediate associated contamination throughout the entire base.						
11. REQUIREMENT: As required. <u>PROJECT:</u> Upgrade the sanitary sewer system. (Current Mission) <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> This is a Level I environmental compliance project. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) requires known releases of hazardous substances to the environment be cleaned up under the laws of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). A condition of the base's RCRA Part B Permit is to remediate the sanitary sewer system, which has been identified by EPA. Repair and upgrade of existing underground sanitary sewer lines is required to prevent environmental contamination, overloading due to storm water infiltration and to protect the health and welfare of individuals working and residing on base. <u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> The existing sewer lines were designed and constructed in 1941 to meet the requirements on Keesler AFB at that time. A TV survey of approximately 20% of the system identified more than 30 breaks or offset joints. Clay and concrete pipe systems have deteriorated, causing ground water and heavy rain infiltration thus causing raw sewage to overflow into the storm water system. This overflow has the potential to pollute the Mississippi Sound and the Back Bay of Biloxi, which are highly used recreational and sensitive shell fish areas. <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> The base is in violation of polluting state waters and under RCRA will be subject to penalties, enforcement action, and possible loss of RCRA permit from EPA. <u>ADDITIONAL:</u> All known alternative options were considered during the development of this project. No other option could meet the mission						

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION KEESLER AIR FORCE BASE, MISSISSIPPI		
4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE SANITARY SEWER SYSTEM	5. PROJECT NUMBER MAHG943010	
<p>requirements; therefore, no economic analysis was needed or performed. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements".</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																																													
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION KEESLER AIR FORCE BASE, MISSISSIPPI																																															
4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE SANITARY SEWER SYSTEM	5. PROJECT NUMBER MAHG943010																																														
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td colspan="3">(1) Status:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td></td> <td>92 SEP 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td></td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td></td> <td>92 DEC 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td></td> <td>93 DEC 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(2) Basis:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td></td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td></td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td></td> <td>170</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td></td> <td>85</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td></td> <td>255</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> <td>210</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td></td> <td>45</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(4) Construction Start</td> <td></td> <td>94 APR</td> </tr> </table> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(1) Status:			(a) Date Design Started		92 SEP 15	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%	(c) Date 35% Designed		92 DEC 15	(d) Date Design Complete		93 DEC 15	(2) Basis:			(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A	(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)			(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		170	(b) All Other Design Costs		85	(c) Total		255	(d) Contract		210	(e) In-house		45	(4) Construction Start		94 APR
(1) Status:																																															
(a) Date Design Started		92 SEP 15																																													
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%																																													
(c) Date 35% Designed		92 DEC 15																																													
(d) Date Design Complete		93 DEC 15																																													
(2) Basis:																																															
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO																																													
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A																																													
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)																																															
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		170																																													
(b) All Other Design Costs		85																																													
(c) Total		255																																													
(d) Contract		210																																													
(e) In-house		45																																													
(4) Construction Start		94 APR																																													

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)							2. DATE		
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION WHITEMAN AIR FORCE BASE, MISSOURI					4. COMMAND AIR COMB/T COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX 1.11			
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	TOTAL
a. As of 30 SEP 92		481	2911	395							3,787
b. End FY 1998		353	2661	361							3,375
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (4,958)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)										478,866	
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:										212,670	
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:										43,538	
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)										30,350	
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:										38,670	
g. Remaining Deficiency:										0	
h. Grand Total:										804,094	
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE			SCOPE		COST (\$000)		DESIGN STATUS		
CODE									START Cmpl		
113-321		B-2 AIRCRAFT APRON/TAXIWAY UPGRADE			LS		3,400		JUN 92 JUL 93		
121-122		B-2 HYDRANT FUELING SYSTEM LOOP II, PHASE II			1,500 LF		2,700		AUG 91 MAY 93		
211-173		B-2 AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE DOCKS			2 EA		14,500		AUG 91 MAY 93		
214-467		B-2 VEHICLE MAINTENANCE FACILITY			7,000 SF		1,700		AUG 92 JUL 93		
422-264		B-2 ADD TO AND ALTER MUNITIONS STORAGE FACILITIES			LS		3,338		AUG 92 AUG 93		
800-000		B-2 UTILITY UPGRADE			LS		4,850		AUG 92 DEC 93		
851-147		B-2 UPGRADE BASE ROADS, PHASE I			LS		5,900		JUN 90 DEC 93		
851-147		B-2 DEFENSE ACCESS ROADS			LS		7,150		MAY 92 JUL 93		
							TOTAL:		43,538		
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995)											
113-321		B-2 AIRCRAFT APRON, TAXIWAY AND CONVOY ROADS			20,900 SY		4,800				
141-453		BASE OPERATIONS FACILITY			16,200 SF		3,050				
211-173		B-2 MAINTENANCE DOCKS/HYDRANT FUELING SYSTEM			2 EA		15,700				
800-000		B-2 ADD TO AND ALTER UTILITY SYSTEM			LS		2,600				
871-183		STORM DRAINAGE FACILITIES			LS		1,000				
872-247		AIRFIELD FENCING			25,400 LF		1,200				
880-000		B-2 ADD TO AND ALTER DOCK AND HANGAR FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEMS			144,000 SF		2,000				
							TOTAL:		30,350		
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
211-111		B-2 AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE DOCKS			LS		25,000				
442-758		WAREHOUSE			107,000 SF		9,900				
740-443		TRANSIENT LODGING FACILITY			8 UN		750				
740-674		PHYSICAL FITNESS CENTER			14,500 SF		2,500				

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)							2. DATE		
AIR FORCE											
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION					4. COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX			
WHITEMAN AIR FORCE BASE, MISSOURI					AIR COMBAT COMMAND			1.11			
6. PERSONNEL		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			
STRENGTH		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	TOTAL
a. As of											
b. End FY											
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage:											
b. Inventory Total As Of:											
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:											
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:											
e. Authorization Included In Following Program:											
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:											
g. Remaining Deficiency:											
h. Grand Total:											
830-000 SANITARY SEWER CONNECTION LS 520											
10. Mission or Major Functions: A missile wing consisting of three Minuteman intercontinental ballistic missile squadrons and a combat air rescue detachment with HH-1 helicopters. Primary base to receive the new B-2 bomber.											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:										0	
b. Water pollution:										1,520	
c. Occupational safety and health:										0	
d. Other Environmental:										0	

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)		2. DATE	
AIR FORCE					
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION			4. PROJECT TITLE		
WHITEMAN AIR FORCE BASE, MISSOURI			B-2 AIRCRAFT APRON/TAXIWAY UPGRADE		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT	6. CATEGORY CODE	7. PROJECT NUMBER	8. PROJECT COST(\$000)		
1.11.27	113-321	YWHG929240	3,400		
9. COST ESTIMATES					
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
B-2 AIRCRAFT APRON/TAXIWAY UPGRADE		SY	16,300	130	2,119
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					780
BLAST FENCE		LF	1,100	709	(780)
SUBTOTAL					2,899
CONTINGENCY (10%)					290
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					3,189
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					191
TOTAL REQUEST					3,380
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					3,400
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Level and grade site; install drainage tile and pipe and tie into drainage system; construct rigid pavement aprons connecting to existing taxiways and munitions convoy routes. Install blast fence.					
11. REQUIREMENT: As required. <u>PROJECT:</u> B-2 aircraft apron/taxiway upgrade. (New Mission) <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> Adequate pavements are required to support all B-2 ground operations. A taxiway and access apron must be provided to allow access from maintenance docks to hardstands (parking positions for weapons upload). Convoy roads are also required to support movement of weapons from the weapons storage area to the aircraft docks and hardstands. Blast fences are required to protect fuel storage tanks. <u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> No access apron exists to provide access to new aircraft maintenance docks, taxiways or munitions convoy roads. <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Aircraft and munitions load trailers will not have access to the maintenance docks and hardstands. Without weapons, the aircraft cannot be readied and will not be able to perform their assigned mission, thereby impacting national defense plans. <u>ADDITIONAL:</u> A preliminary analysis of reasonable options for accomplishing this project was done. It indicates there is only one option that will meet operational requirements. Consequently, a full economic analysis was not performed. A certificate of exclusion has been prepared. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide;" however, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements."					

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION WHITEMAN AIR FORCE BASE, MISSOURI																								
4. PROJECT TITLE B-2 AIRCRAFT APRON/TAXIWAY UPGRADE	5. PROJECT NUMBER YWHG929240																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="340 625 1414 758"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 JUN 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 AUG 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 JUL 28</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="340 821 1414 884"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>YES</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>WHITEMAN</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="340 947 1414 1108"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>210</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>105</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>315</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>315</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 JAN</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 JUN 15	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 AUG 15	(d) Date Design Complete	93 JUL 28	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	YES	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	WHITEMAN	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	210	(b) All Other Design Costs	105	(c) Total	315	(d) Contract		(e) In-house	315
(a) Date Design Started	92 JUN 15																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 AUG 15																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 JUL 28																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	YES																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	WHITEMAN																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	210																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	105																							
(c) Total	315																							
(d) Contract																								
(e) In-house	315																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)		2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION WHITEMAN AIR FORCE BASE, MISSOURI			4. PROJECT TITLE B-2 HYDRANT FUELING SYSTEM LOOP II, PHASE II		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 1.11.27	6. CATEGORY CODE 121-122	7. PROJECT NUMBER YWHG959204	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 2,700		
9. COST ESTIMATES					
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
B-2 HYDRANT FUELING SYSTEM LOOP II, PHASE II		LF	1,800	800	1,440
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					990
UTILITIES		LS			(135)
PAVEMENTS		LS			(65)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(215)
FUEL PITS AND DRAINS		LS			(575)
SUBTOTAL					2,430
CONTINGENCY (5%)					122
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					2,552
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					153
TOTAL REQUEST					2,705
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					2,700
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Fuel piping distribution network for remaining docks, access road for vehicles and other necessary support.					
11. REQUIREMENT: As required. <u>PROJECT:</u> Construct B-2 hydrant fueling system, loop II, phase II. (New Mission) <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> A 4,800 gallon per minute (GPM) hydrant fuel system capable of providing 1,200 GPM to each of four aircraft simultaneously or 600 GPM to each of eight aircraft simultaneously. Force generation schedules for war and contingency missions require simultaneous fueling of multiple aircraft, which requires a system with a capacity of 4,800 GPM. Refueling outlets located inside B-2 maintenance docks will be supplied by this distribution loop. <u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> FY 90-93 Military Construction (MILCON) projects have provided a 4,800 GPM two-loop hydrant fueling system with distribution to eight maintenance dock spaces (FY 88-93 MILCON). This project completes the final phase of the second loop by providing fuel distribution for six future maintenance docks. <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> B-2 refueling will have to be from tank trucks, a time consuming, labor intensive process that will not allow the wing to meet mission generation times. Accordingly, the Air Force has not programmed procurement of the large number of refueling trucks that would be required for truck refueling of the B-2. <u>ADDITIONAL:</u> A preliminary analysis of reasonable options for accomplishing this project was done. It indicates there is only one option that will meet operational requirements. Consequently, a full economic analysis was not performed. A certificate of exclusion has been					

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION WHITEMAN AIR FORCE BASE, MISSOURI		
4. PROJECT TITLE B-2 HYDRANT FUELING SYSTEM LOOP II, PHASE II	5. PROJECT NUMBER YWHG959204	
<p>prepared. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide;" however, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements."</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																																													
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION WHITEMAN AIR FORCE BASE, MISSOURI																																															
4. PROJECT TITLE B-2 HYDRANT FUELING SYSTEM LOOP II, PHASE II	5. PROJECT NUMBER YWHG959204																																														
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td colspan="3">(1) Status:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td></td> <td>91 AUG 22</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td></td> <td>65%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td></td> <td>92 MAR 10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td></td> <td>93 MAY 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(2) Basis:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td></td> <td>135</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td></td> <td>135</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td></td> <td>135</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(4) Construction Start</td> <td></td> <td>94 MAY</td> </tr> </table> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(1) Status:			(a) Date Design Started		91 AUG 22	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		65%	(c) Date 35% Designed		92 MAR 10	(d) Date Design Complete		93 MAY 15	(2) Basis:			(a) Standard or Definitive Design -			(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -			(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)			(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		135	(b) All Other Design Costs			(c) Total		135	(d) Contract			(e) In-house		135	(4) Construction Start		94 MAY
(1) Status:																																															
(a) Date Design Started		91 AUG 22																																													
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		65%																																													
(c) Date 35% Designed		92 MAR 10																																													
(d) Date Design Complete		93 MAY 15																																													
(2) Basis:																																															
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -																																															
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -																																															
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)																																															
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		135																																													
(b) All Other Design Costs																																															
(c) Total		135																																													
(d) Contract																																															
(e) In-house		135																																													
(4) Construction Start		94 MAY																																													

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION WHITEMAN AIR FORCE BASE, MISSOURI			4. PROJECT TITLE B-2 AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE DOCKS			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 1.11.27		6. CATEGORY CODE 211-173	7. PROJECT NUMBER YWHG939279	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 14,500		
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
B-2 AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE DOCKS		SF	52,500	160	8,400	
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					4,625	
UTILITIES		LS			(435)	
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(350)	
PAVEMENTS		LS			(640)	
HYD/CASS		LS			(3,200)	
SUBTOTAL					13,025	
CONTINGENCY (5%)					651	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					13,676	
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					821	
TOTAL REQUEST					14,497	
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					14,500	
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Heated steel frame structures with powered hangar doors, fire protection system, and prewired conduit for phone, data and security systems. Ground points in floor, oil/water separator, blast deflectors and Consolidated Aircraft Support System (CASS) (pantograph system, outlets and air conditioning). Inverted deluge system (ID [~]) underwing fire suppression. Air Conditioning: 130 Tons.						
11. REQUIREMENT: 367,500 EA ADEQUATE: 157,500 EA SUBSTANDARD: 0 <u>PROJECT</u> : Construct B-2 aircraft maintenance docks. (New Mission) <u>REQUIREMENT</u> : All B-2 aircraft assigned to the base must have an enclosed space to permit maintenance under all environmental conditions. Enclosed facilities will include 14 maintenance docks, a fuel cell dock, corrosion control dock, and a heavy maintenance hangar (two spaces). This project provides maintenance docks 7 and 8. B-2 docks are constructed in pairs due to the shared hydrant fuel/CASS area. The docks provide a minimally heated environment for maintenance crews to work on structural, propulsion and electronic components. The dock must withstand jet blast as aircraft taxi out. Rear doors are sized for access by munitions loading trailers. Construction is phased to accommodate aircraft delivery and to take advantage of economies of scale. Refueling and CASS provisions are required in each maintenance space. <u>CURRENT SITUATION</u> : Three maintenance spaces (fuel cell, corrosion control and one dock) were provided in the FY 88 MILCON and three in the FY 89 MILCON (alter existing hangar = 2 spaces; and 1 dock). Two maintenance dock spaces are in FY 91 and two in FY93. Six additional spaces will be programmed in future years (two spaces in FY 95 and the remainder in later years). No other facilities are available to provide covered maintenance						

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION WHITEMAN AIR FORCE BASE, MISSOURI		
4. PROJECT TITLE B-2 AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE DOCKS	5. PROJECT NUMBER YWHG939279	
<p>space for aircraft already authorized.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Because of the aircraft's low observable features, structural and propulsion maintenance tasks will have to be performed frequently. Complete coverage of the aircraft while on the ground will increase combat capability by reducing maintenance task times, repaint downtime, and fleet generation time. Failure to provide the necessary covered maintenance space will reduce aircraft availability and mission effectiveness, while increasing maintenance and turn-around time for the aircraft.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> A preliminary analysis of reasonable options for accomplishing this project was done. It indicates there is only one option that will meet operational requirements. Consequently, a full economic analysis was not performed. A certificate of exclusion has been prepared. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide," nor in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements."</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																		
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION WHITEMAN AIR FORCE BASE, MISSOURI																				
4. PROJECT TITLE B-2 AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE DOCKS	5. PROJECT NUMBER YWHG939279																			
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="354 646 1398 772"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>91 AUG 22</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>65%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>91 NOV 04</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 MAY 15</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <p>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</p> <p>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</p> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="354 961 1398 1121"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>310</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>100</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>410</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>410</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 MAY</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	91 AUG 22	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	65%	(c) Date 35% Designed	91 NOV 04	(d) Date Design Complete	93 MAY 15	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	310	(b) All Other Design Costs	100	(c) Total	410	(d) Contract		(e) In-house	410
(a) Date Design Started	91 AUG 22																			
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	65%																			
(c) Date 35% Designed	91 NOV 04																			
(d) Date Design Complete	93 MAY 15																			
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	310																			
(b) All Other Design Costs	100																			
(c) Total	410																			
(d) Contract																				
(e) In-house	410																			

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)				2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION WHITEMAN AIR FORCE BASE, MISSOURI			4. PROJECT TITLE B-2 VEHICLE MAINTENANCE FACILITY				
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 1.11.27		6. CATEGORY CODE 214-467	7. PROJECT NUMBER YWHG949205		8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 1,700		
9. COST ESTIMATES							
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)		
B-2 VEHICLE MAINTENANCE FACILITY		LS			1,095		
VEHICLE REFUELING SHOP		SF	4,000	180	(720)		
PETROLEUM OPERATIONS FACILITY		SF	3,000	125	(375)		
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					440		
UTILITIES		LS			(150)		
PAVEMENTS		LS			(225)		
DEMOLISH BUILDINGS		SF	2,300	7	(15)		
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(50)		
SUBTOTAL					1,535		
CONTINGENCY (5%)					77		
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					1,612		
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					97		
TOTAL REQUEST					1,709		
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					1,700		
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Concrete footings, block walls, brick veneer, and pitched metal roof. Facility will include wash rack/inspection bay, three maintenance bays, shops, storage, and administration space. Includes oil/water separator, connection to industrial wastewater treatment, entrapment curbs/dikes, security fencing, fire protection, utilities, pavements, and associated work. Air Conditioning: 16 Tons.							
11. REQUIREMENT: 7,000 SF ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 1,950 SF PROJECT: Construct B-2 vehicle maintenance facility. (New Mission) REQUIREMENT: A maintenance shop is needed to service aircraft refueling vehicles and associated fuel handling equipment to support the B-2 mission. The number of refueling vehicles has more than doubled due to the increased workload associated with 18 T-38s and 24 A/OA-10s (T-38s support B-2s through the Accelerated Copilot Enrichment program). Although the B-2s will be serviced primarily via the hydrant system, the T-38s and A/OA-10s will be serviced strictly by refueling vehicles. A four-bay facility is required for the following functions: One bay provides for operations functions, wash rack, inspection, dispatch, emergency showers, latrines, and a locker room for removing fuel contaminated-clothing. One bay is used primarily for storage of the large amount of test equipment. The remaining two bays are strictly for performing maintenance. CURRENT SITUATION: No adequately sized facility exists to accommodate the new refueling vehicles and expansion of the existing two-bay facility is not feasible. The existing bays are four feet too short to accommodate an R-11 refueling vehicle. They lack OSHA-required ventilation to prevent maintenance personnel from being exposed to fuel fumes. The facility							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION WHITEMAN AIR FORCE BASE, MISSOURI		
4. PROJECT TITLE B-2 VEHICLE MAINTENANCE FACILITY	5. PROJECT NUMBER YWHG949205	
<p>lacks a fire suppression system, and it does not have fuel/water separators and spill containment features the Clean Water Act requires. The existing fuel storage tanks do not meet EPA underground storage tank standards for leak detection or spill prevention and have released fuels into the base sewer treatment plant in violation of the base's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit. The environmental, fire, structural, and safety limitations of the existing facility would make expansion expensive. In addition, the existing facility is located two miles from the flightline, which means the large refueling vehicles are driven back and forth through community and dormitory areas. The existing 2,300 SF facility will be demolished with this project.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Without this project, the base cannot properly maintain the refueling vehicles that directly support Whiteman's flying missions. In addition, if this facility is not constructed, unsafe refueling maintenance and repair techniques may be employed in an attempt to meet mission needs, which may result in costly damage to equipment and injury to personnel. Lastly the Air Force could be liable for environmental fines resulting from EPA/DNR notices of violation.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, Facility Planning and Design Guide. However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements".</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																		
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION WHITEMAN AIR FORCE BASE, MISSOURI																				
4. PROJECT TITLE B-2 VEHICLE MAINTENANCE FACILITY	5. PROJECT NUMBER YWHG949205																			
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="343 625 1409 758"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 AUG 20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 NOV 16</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 JUL 30</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <p>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</p> <p>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</p> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="343 947 1409 1108"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>102</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>251</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>353</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>195</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>158</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 AUG 20	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 NOV 16	(d) Date Design Complete	93 JUL 30	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	102	(b) All Other Design Costs	251	(c) Total	353	(d) Contract	195	(e) In-house	158
(a) Date Design Started	92 AUG 20																			
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																			
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 NOV 16																			
(d) Date Design Complete	93 JUL 30																			
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	102																			
(b) All Other Design Costs	251																			
(c) Total	353																			
(d) Contract	195																			
(e) In-house	158																			

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)				2. DATE		
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION WHITEMAN AIR FORCE BASE, MISSOURI			4. PROJECT TITLE B-2 ADD TO AND ALTER MUNITIONS STORAGE FACILITIES					
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 1.11.27		6. CATEGORY CODE 422-264	7. PROJECT NUMBER YWHG949209		8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 3,338			
9. COST ESTIMATES								
ITEM					U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
B-2 ADD TO AND ALTER MUNITIONS STORAGE FACILITIES					LS			2,294
ALTER STORAGE IGLOO					SF	10,700	32	(342)
ROTARY LAUNCHER STORAGE FACILITY					SF	6,000	120	(720)
ADD STORAGE IGLOO					SF	5,600	220	(1,232)
SUPPORTING FACILITIES								565
UTILITIES					LS			(160)
PAVEMENTS					LS			(350)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS					LS			(55)
SUBTOTAL								2,859
CONTINGENCY (10%)								286
TOTAL CONTRACT COST								3,145
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)								189
TOTAL REQUEST								3,334
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)								3,338
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Earthwork and concrete foundations. Alter/upgrade existing igloos and adjoining pavements for B-2 conventional munitions storage requirements. Provide steel rotary launcher assembly (RLA) storage facility with roll-up doors and concrete ramp on each end of the igloos and the new RLA building, necessary utilities, and fire protection.								
11. REQUIREMENT: As required. PROJECT: B-2 add to and alter munitions storage facilities. (New Mission) REQUIREMENT: Adequate storage for conventional munitions and rotary launcher equipment for the B-2 aircraft. All of the existing eleven Minuteman II munitions storage igloos must be altered to accommodate B-2 conventional munitions storage. The igloo must be of sufficient construction and condition to store conventional B-2 weapons safely and securely. An all weather building is required to store and protect rotary launcher assemblies (RLAs) and launch loading adaptors (LLAs). A 100-ft wide apron is required at the end of the RLA/LLA storage facility to allow for access of B-2 munitions handling equipment. CURRENT SITUATION: The base has insufficient storage capacity for B-2 conventional munitions and rotary launcher assemblies. No space is available to accommodate the rotary launcher assembly storage requirement. IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: Storage for munitions and related equipment will not be available. ADDITIONAL: A preliminary analysis of reasonable options for accomplishing this project was done. It indicates there is only one option that will meet operational requirements. Consequently, a full economic analysis was not performed. A certificate of exclusion has been prepared. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of								

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION WHITEMAN AIR FORCE BASE, MISSOURI		
4. PROJECT TITLE B-2 ADD TO AND ALTER MUNITIONS STORAGE FACILITIES	5. PROJECT NUMBER YWHG949209	
<p>Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide;" however, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements."</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION WHITEMAN AIR FORCE BASE, MISSOURI																								
4. PROJECT TITLE B-2 ADD TO AND ALTER MUNITIONS STORAGE FACILITIES	5. PROJECT NUMBER YWHG949209																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="330 609 1428 756"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 AUG 13</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 DEC 09</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 AUG 01</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="330 798 1428 882"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="330 924 1428 1113"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>180</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>188</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>368</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>368</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 AUG 13	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 DEC 09	(d) Date Design Complete	93 AUG 01	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	180	(b) All Other Design Costs	188	(c) Total	368	(d) Contract		(e) In-house	368
(a) Date Design Started	92 AUG 13																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 DEC 09																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 AUG 01																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	180																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	188																							
(c) Total	368																							
(d) Contract																								
(e) In-house	368																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION WHITEMAN AIR FORCE BASE, MISSOURI			4. PROJECT TITLE B-2 UTILITY UPGRADE			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 1.11.27	6. CATEGORY CODE 800-000	7. PROJECT NUMBER YWHG942500	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 4,850			
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
B-2 UTILITY UPGRADE		LS			3,950	
ELEC DISTR AND TRANS LINES		LS			(150)	
WASTE/STORM COLLECTION SYSTEM		LS			(625)	
RELOCATE COMM LINES		LS			(300)	
TERTIARY TREATMENT LAGOON SYSTEM		LS			(2,875)	
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					185	
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(85)	
PAVEMENTS		LS			(100)	
SUBTOTAL					4,135	
CONTINGENCY (10%)					414	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					4,549	
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					273	
TOTAL REQUEST					4,822	
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					4,850	
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Water, sewer, industrial waste treatment, pavements, transformers, poles, gas distribution, and electric cable. Associated demolition, excavation of valves, and manholes; connections to existing utilities.						
11. REQUIREMENT: As required. PROJECT: B-2 utility upgrade. (New Mission) REQUIREMENT: On-base utilities and infrastructure require expansion to support an increased demand associated with the B-2 mission. Electrical power, sewer, water and industrial wastewater treatment must be upgraded and expanded to support the construction of hydrant fuel systems, maintenance docks, vehicle maintenance and weapons storage facilities. The storm water collection system requires upgrade to remain in compliance with the Clean Water Act (40 CFR 122.26), after completion of the facilities mentioned above causes an increase in storm water runoff. A tertiary sewage treatment lagoon system is required to remove heavy metals and toxic compounds from the runoff collected from the airfield and maintenance docks. CURRENT SITUATION: Existing base utility systems were built in the 1950s and are not capable of supporting the new facilities being built to support the B-2 mission. Whiteman AFB utility systems have been partially upgraded through the FY 88-93 MILCON programs; however, facilities constructed in subsequent programs require additional funding for connection to main systems, and the main systems themselves require upgrade to meet the added demands. IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: The existing utility system will be unable to support the new facilities constructed as part of the B-2 beddown. Lack of adequate utilities will reduce day-to-day operating capability, and, in						

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION WHITEMAN AIR FORCE BASE, MISSOURI		
4. PROJECT TITLE B-2 UTILITY UPGRADE	5. PROJECT NUMBER YWHG942500	
<p>the case of the storm water collection system, could result in storm water runoff violating the Clean Water Act. Violations could result in heavy fines and shut down of airfield operations. Similarly, not constructing the tertiary treatment lagoon would lead to violations of the base's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit, once new B-2 facilities become operational.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements".</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																																													
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION WHITEMAN AIR FORCE BASE, MISSOURI																																															
4. PROJECT TITLE B-2 UTILITY UPGRADE	5. PROJECT NUMBER YWHG942500																																														
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td colspan="3">(1) Status:</td> </tr> <tr> <td> (a) Date Design Started</td> <td></td> <td>92 AUG 08</td> </tr> <tr> <td> (b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td></td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td> (c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td></td> <td>92 DEC 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td> (d) Date Design Complete</td> <td></td> <td>93 DEC 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(2) Basis:</td> </tr> <tr> <td> (a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td> (b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</td> </tr> <tr> <td> (a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td></td> <td>85</td> </tr> <tr> <td> (b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td></td> <td>35</td> </tr> <tr> <td> (c) Total</td> <td></td> <td>120</td> </tr> <tr> <td> (d) Contract</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td> (e) In-house</td> <td></td> <td>120</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(4) Construction Start</td> <td></td> <td>94 MAR</td> </tr> </table> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(1) Status:			(a) Date Design Started		92 AUG 08	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%	(c) Date 35% Designed		92 DEC 15	(d) Date Design Complete		93 DEC 01	(2) Basis:			(a) Standard or Definitive Design -			(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -			(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)			(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		85	(b) All Other Design Costs		35	(c) Total		120	(d) Contract			(e) In-house		120	(4) Construction Start		94 MAR
(1) Status:																																															
(a) Date Design Started		92 AUG 08																																													
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%																																													
(c) Date 35% Designed		92 DEC 15																																													
(d) Date Design Complete		93 DEC 01																																													
(2) Basis:																																															
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -																																															
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -																																															
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)																																															
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		85																																													
(b) All Other Design Costs		35																																													
(c) Total		120																																													
(d) Contract																																															
(e) In-house		120																																													
(4) Construction Start		94 MAR																																													

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION WHITEMAN AIR FORCE BASE, MISSOURI			4. PROJECT TITLE B-2 UPGRADE BASE ROADS, PHASE I			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 1.11.27		6. CATEGORY CODE 851-147	7. PROJECT NUMBER YWHG919240	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 5,900		
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
B-2 UPGRADE BASE ROADS, PHASE I		LS			4,573	
MITCHELL AVENUE AND SEVENTH STREET		LF	10,700	410	(4,387)	
VISITOR CENTER		SF	1,200	155	(186)	
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					450	
RELOCATE UTILITIES		LS			(100)	
STORM DRAINAGE		LS			(200)	
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(75)	
PARKING PAVEMENTS AND DRAINS		LS			(75)	
SUBTOTAL					5,023	
CONTINGENCY (10%)					502	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					5,525	
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					332	
TOTAL REQUEST					5,857	
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					5,900	
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Relocate required utilities. Demolish and reconstruct Mitchell Avenue and Seventh Street. Provide new subbase and concrete roadways for two lanes and a continuous left turn lane on Mitchell. Include curb and gutter, sidewalk, storm sewer and streetlighting. Add visitor center with parking near Mitchell Gate. Construct terrorist barriers at entrance gates. Air Conditioning: 5 Tons.						
11. REQUIREMENT: As required. <u>PROJECT</u> : Upgrade base roads, Phase I. (New Mission) <u>REQUIREMENT</u> : Adequate roadways and traffic control to provide safe and efficient flow of traffic throughout the base. In this phase, Mitchell Avenue will be widened to serve the dorm complex, community center, and administrative areas. A Visitor Center is required to divert visitor traffic from the main traffic flow and process individuals for entry to the base. Terrorist barriers are required at the main gates for immediate closure in the event of threatening conditions. In Phase II, a heavy duty road is required from the Mitchell Gate to the industrial area and to the fuel storage area for increased fuel deliveries via truck. Phase II is programmed for FY 96 at \$5.8 million. <u>CURRENT SITUATION</u> : Existing base streets and roads were not constructed to handle the volume and/or weight loads of vehicles associated with the dual wing mission or the construction activity for the B-2 mission beddown. The construction traffic and numerous utility cuts in the roadways (Mitchell Avenue has been cut and repaired 25 times during B-2 beddown construction) have virtually destroyed the existing base road infrastructure. Continuous temporary repairs to the damaged base roads are allowing base operations to continue. Traffic currently enters the						

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION WHITEMAN AIR FORCE BASE, MISSOURI		
4. PROJECT TITLE B-2 UPGRADE BASE ROADS, PHASE I	5. PROJECT NUMBER YWHG919240	
<p>base from two twenty-four hour gates and one part-time gate and is constricted to two lanes, one inbound and one outbound. The main roads through the base are already congested. Use of Mitchell Avenue by trucks has been restricted because of limited load (design) capacity of the pavement. Congestion frequently develops at the Mitchell Gate because there are no adequate parking facilities for visitors while they obtain proper clearances to enter the base.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> The combination of high traffic volume and inadequate base thoroughfares will result in potentially serious safety problems as traffic backs up onto off-base access roads during the morning rush hour. Traffic entering the base will encounter delays as the existing two-lane roads cannot efficiently handle the traffic load generated by the added B-2 mission. The safety of over 6,000 military and civilian personnel could be jeopardized by deteriorated roads which were not designed to handle the current or future traffic demands.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> A preliminary analysis of reasonable options for accomplishing this project was done. It indicates there is only one option that will meet operational requirements. Consequently, a full economic analysis was not performed. A certificate of exclusion has been prepared. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide;" however, this project does meet the scope/criteria specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements."</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																																													
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION WHITEMAN AIR FORCE BASE, MISSOURI																																															
4. PROJECT TITLE B-2 UPGRADE BASE ROADS, PHASE I	5. PROJECT NUMBER YWHG919240																																														
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td colspan="3">(1) Status:</td> </tr> <tr> <td> (a) Date Design Started</td> <td></td> <td>90 JUN 04</td> </tr> <tr> <td> (b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td></td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td> (c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td></td> <td>90 AUG 20</td> </tr> <tr> <td> (d) Date Design Complete</td> <td></td> <td>93 DEC 06</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(2) Basis:</td> </tr> <tr> <td> (a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td> (b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e):</td> </tr> <tr> <td> (a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td></td> <td>(\$000) 448</td> </tr> <tr> <td> (b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td></td> <td>80</td> </tr> <tr> <td> (c) Total</td> <td></td> <td>528</td> </tr> <tr> <td> (d) Contract</td> <td></td> <td>289</td> </tr> <tr> <td> (e) In-house</td> <td></td> <td>239</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(4) Construction Start</td> <td></td> <td>94 MAY</td> </tr> </table> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(1) Status:			(a) Date Design Started		90 JUN 04	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%	(c) Date 35% Designed		90 AUG 20	(d) Date Design Complete		93 DEC 06	(2) Basis:			(a) Standard or Definitive Design -			(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -			(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e):			(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		(\$000) 448	(b) All Other Design Costs		80	(c) Total		528	(d) Contract		289	(e) In-house		239	(4) Construction Start		94 MAY
(1) Status:																																															
(a) Date Design Started		90 JUN 04																																													
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%																																													
(c) Date 35% Designed		90 AUG 20																																													
(d) Date Design Complete		93 DEC 06																																													
(2) Basis:																																															
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -																																															
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -																																															
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e):																																															
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		(\$000) 448																																													
(b) All Other Design Costs		80																																													
(c) Total		528																																													
(d) Contract		289																																													
(e) In-house		239																																													
(4) Construction Start		94 MAY																																													

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)		2. DATE	
AIR FORCE					
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION			4. PROJECT TITLE		
WHITEMAN AIR FORCE BASE, MISSOURI			B-2 DEFENSE ACCESS ROADS		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT	6. CATEGORY CODE	7. PROJECT NUMBER	8. PROJECT COST(\$000)		
1.11.27	851-147	YWHG939302	7,150		
9. COST ESTIMATES					
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
B-2 DEFENSE ACCESS ROADS		LS			5,395
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					1,010
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(555)
PAVEMENTS		LS			(455)
SUBTOTAL					6,405
CONTINGENCY (5%)					320
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					6,725
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					404
TOTAL REQUEST					7,129
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					7,150
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Demolish existing pavements, reconstruct a wider road with adequate subbase and asphalt pavement. Includes concrete curbs, storm drains, street and traffic lighting. Relocate buried utilities and stripe roads.					
11. REQUIREMENT: As required. PROJECT: Construct defense access roads. (New Mission) REQUIREMENT: Provide required safe access to the base gates on the west side of the base from State Highway 23 and US Highway 50, via a diamond interchange and connector to State route 132. This is the last phase of a multi-phase effort. CURRENT SITUATION: FY 91 B-2 MILCON funds constructed bridges, installed roadway subbase in areas of Highway 50/23/Route 132 connector and upgraded subbase and pavement on existing route 132. However, these public access roads to the base are still inadequate for any increased traffic volume. Although the preceding work improved the condition of the existing roads to Whiteman AFB, it did not increase the volume of traffic they could safely accommodate. After a defense access road "needs" report submittal to the Military Traffic Management Command (MTMC, US Army) for review, validation and coordination with federal, state, and local transportation agencies, MTMC determined that widening Route 132 from the base to Route 50, constructing an interchange at the intersection of Routes 132, 23 and 50, and realigning State Route 23 are all needed to handle traffic volume. All are eligible for federal funding. IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: Public access roads, US Highway 50, State Highway 23 and State Route 132 leading to and from the base, will remain inadequate to handle traffic volume. Without these improvements, significant traffic hazards will go unabated. Excess volume on the					

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION WHITEMAN AIR FORCE BASE, MISSOURI		
4. PROJECT TITLE B-2 DEFENSE ACCESS ROADS	5. PROJECT NUMBER YWHG939302	
<p>existing roads will make driving unsafe as will traffic entering arterial Highway 50 from a perpendicular secondary state road.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> A preliminary analysis of reasonable options for accomplishing this project was done. It indicates there is only one option that will meet operational requirements. Consequently, a full economic analysis was not performed. A certificate of exclusion has been prepared. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide," nor in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements."</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION WHITEMAN AIR FORCE BASE, MISSOURI																								
4. PROJECT TITLE B-2 DEFENSE ACCESS ROADS	5. PROJECT NUMBER YWHG939302																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="346 619 1412 756"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 MAY 06</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>65%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 SEP 20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 JUL 30</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="346 808 1412 882"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="346 934 1412 1102"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>300</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>100</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>400</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>400</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 MAR</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 MAY 06	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	65%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 SEP 20	(d) Date Design Complete	93 JUL 30	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	300	(b) All Other Design Costs	100	(c) Total	400	(d) Contract		(e) In-house	400
(a) Date Design Started	92 MAY 06																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	65%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 SEP 20																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 JUL 30																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	300																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	100																							
(c) Total	400																							
(d) Contract																								
(e) In-house	400																							

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)							2. DATE			
AIR FORCE												
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION					4. COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX				
MALMSTROM AIR FORCE BASE, MONTANA					AIR MOBILITY COMMAND			1.20				
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED				
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	TOTAL	
a. As of 30 SEP 92		640	3766	479				1	8	1	4,895	
b. End FY 1998		654	3680	471				1	8	1	4,815	
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)												
a. Total Acreage: (3,659)										
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)											308,189	
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:											24,290	
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:											7,700	
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)											11,500	
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:											42,550	
g. Remaining Deficiency:											0	
h. Grand Total:											394,229	
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994												
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE			SCOPE		OST (\$000)	DESIGN STATUS				
CODE							START	Cmpl				
219-944	BASE ENGINEERING COMPLEX (DBOF)			56,100 SF		6,200	DEC 88	JUN 93				
411-135	UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS MINUTEMAN II FACILITIES			25 EA		1,500	DEC 92	SEP 93				
						TOTAL:	7,700					
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995)												
141-453	BASE OPERATIONS AND TRAINING			8,715 SF		2,250						
411-135	UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS			50 EA		3,200						
411-135	UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS MINUTEMAN III FACILITIES			32 EA		4,000						
740-884	ADD TO AND ALTER CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER			10,500 SF		1,050						
871-183	UPGRADE STORM DRAINAGE FACILITIES			LS		1,000						
						TOTAL:	11,500					
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:												
141-782	AIR FREIGHT TERMINAL			LS		2,300						
141-911	ADD TO AND ALTER MISSILE OPERATIONS BUILDING			78,900 SF		9,200						
141-911	ADD TO AND ALTER MISSILE OPERATIONS BUILDING			74,600 SF		8,600						
212-216	ADD TO AND ALTER MISSILE MAINTENANCE SHOP			10,400 SF		2,150						
610-249	MISSILE COMBAT OPERATIONS CENTER			49,000 SF		8,700						
10. Mission or Major Functions: An air refueling wing with two KC-135 squadrons; and Air Combat Command missile wing consisting of our Minuteman intercontinental ballistic missile squadrons, one of which maintains a continuous alert posture, and a combat air rescue detachment with UH-1 helicopters.												

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)							2. DATE			
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION MALMSTROM AIR FORCE BASE, MONTANA					4. COMMAND AIR MOBILITY COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX 1.20			
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	TOTAL
a. As of											
b. End FY											
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: b. Inventory Total As Of: c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory: d. Authorization Requested In This Program: e. Authorization Included In Following Program: f. Planned In Next Four Program Years: g. Remaining Deficiency: h. Grand Total:											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:										0	
b. Water pollution:										1,500	
c. Occupational safety and health:										0	
d. Other Environmental:										6,350	

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)		2. DATE	
AIR FORCE					
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION			4. PROJECT TITLE		
MALMSTROM AIR FORCE BASE, MONTANA			BASE ENGINEERING COMPLEX (DBOF)		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT	6. CATEGORY CODE	7. PROJECT NUMBER	8. PROJECT COST(\$000)		
1.18.96M	219-944	NZAS943250	6,200		
9. COST ESTIMATES					
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
BASE ENGINEERING COMPLEX (DBOF)		SF	47,900		4,753
BASE PAVEMENTS & GROUND FACILITY		SF	17,500	150	(2,625)
BASE ENGINEER COVERED STORAGE		SF	30,400	70	(2,128)
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					840
UTILITIES/COMM SUPPORT		LS			(740)
PAVEMENTS		SY	2,800	36	(100)
SUBTOTAL					5,593
CONTINGENCY (5%)					280
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					5,873
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					352
TOTAL REQUEST					6,225
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					6,200
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Reinforced concrete foundation footings and floor slabs, concrete masonry unit or reinforced precast concrete walls, sloped roof on steel deck, electrically operated vehicle doors, utility services, oil/water separator, storm drainage, parking and storage area pavement upgrade, curbs, gutters, security fencing, CID, fire protection, area lighting and necessary support. Air Conditioning: 10 Tons.					
11. REQUIREMENT: 163,415 SF ADEQUATE: 107,353 SF SUBSTANDARD: 47,332 SF PROJECT: Construct a base engineering complex. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: Adequate and properly configured facilities are required to house base and missile site workforce management and control and in-house engineering and contract management staffs. Covered storage is required to protect construction materials and snow removal equipment/materials from pilferage and exposure to the deteriorating influences of the weather. Properly configured pavements and grounds and maintenance shop space must be provided for effective execution of facility and utility maintenance and repair responsibilities throughout the base, and off-base missile launch and control facilities. These functions must have an environment conducive to the effective maintenance and support of all facilities, and design/construction of facility projects. Overall space requirements have been adjusted downward in view of reduced future manning for the BCE organization. CURRENT SITUATION: Adequate and safe facilities are not available. The pavements and equipment shop, exterior electric, equipment and material staging areas, and the management offices to support missile engineering, readiness management and training are currently accommodated in a					

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION MALMSTROM AIR FORCE BASE, MONTANA		
4. PROJECT TITLE BASE ENGINEERING COMPLEX (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER NZAS943250	
<p>deteriorated World War II wood frame hangar. The facility has been assigned an OSHA Risk Assessment Code (RAC) II, and a Fire Protection Deficiency Code of II, both identifying a serious deficiency which could result in loss of life or resources valued at over \$1M. Because of its location on the flightline, the facility also creates a hazard for aircraft operations due to mud and debris falling from maintenance vehicles and creating a foreign object damage potential for aircraft. The wood roof and wall trusses are cracked and rotten and the built-up roof leaks onto equipment and materials stored in the facility. The hangar has large sections where the cement asbestos siding is missing and has been replaced with painted plywood. The hangar has no wall or roof insulation and no fire suppression or detection systems. Most of the electrical distribution and lighting systems are 1943 vintage and are totally inadequate. The electrical distribution system is overloaded and is a fire hazard. A portion of the base engineer materials and equipment staging areas are located separately from the maintenance complex. This project will consolidate these functions.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Base Civil Engineering management and support functions will continue operating from unsafe, undersized, separated and inadequate facilities which negatively impact mission capability and the morale of assigned personnel. The potential for catastrophic fire or industrial accident with serious injuries or significant loss of life and resources will remain unacceptably high.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements". An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of new construction, revitalization, leasing and status quo operation. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, new construction was found to be the most cost efficient over the life of the project. Project has been considered for FY97 force structure end strength.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION MALMSTROM AIR FORCE BASE, MONTANA																								
4. PROJECT TITLE BASE ENGINEERING COMPLEX (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER NZAS943250																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="343 634 1392 768"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>88 DEC 22</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>90 SEP 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 JUN 01</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="343 832 1392 895"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="343 959 1392 1119"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>372</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>180</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>552</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>439</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>113</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	88 DEC 22	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	90 SEP 15	(d) Date Design Complete	93 JUN 01	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	372	(b) All Other Design Costs	180	(c) Total	552	(d) Contract	439	(e) In-house	113
(a) Date Design Started	88 DEC 22																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	90 SEP 15																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 JUN 01																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	372																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	180																							
(c) Total	552																							
(d) Contract	439																							
(e) In-house	113																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)				2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION MALMSTROM AIR FORCE BASE, MONTANA			4. PROJECT TITLE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS MINUTEMAN II FACILITIES				
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 1.18.56M		6. CATEGORY CODE 411-135	7. PROJECT NUMBER NZAS932500		8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 1,500		
9. COST ESTIMATES							
ITEM			U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS MINUTEMAN II FACILITIES			EA	15	85,730	1,286	
SUBTOTAL						1,286	
CONTINGENCY (10%)						129	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST						1,415	
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)						85	
TOTAL REQUEST						1,500	
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)						1,500	
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Excavate and remove 15 underground storage tanks. Dispose of tank residue and test soil at each site. Remove and dispose of any contaminated soil. Replace tanks with new double-walled tanks, interstitial leak detectors, double wall piping, spill/overflow protectors, corrosion control and necessary support.							
11. REQUIREMENT: 269 EA ADEQUATE: 165 EA SUBSTANDARD: 95 EA PROJECT: Replace underground fuel storage tanks (USTs), Minuteman II facilities. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: This is a Level II environmental compliance requirement. All regulated USTs must be upgraded in accordance with Federal Law (40CFR 280.21) by December 1998. The law also requires underground tanks have leak detection, corrosion protection and spill/overflow prevention systems to protect human health and the environment. CURRENT SITUATION: Underground storage tanks at missile sites in Montana do not meet Federal regulatory requirements for corrosion protection, leak detection monitoring and overflow/spill protection. These deficiencies must be corrected to prevent violation of Federal UST regulations. Currently, 95 USTs at missile launch and launch control facilities require upgrade or replacement to meet the 1998 Federal deadline. This project is the first of four phases, and will replace 15 USTs at 15 launch facilities. Unit costs for this project are higher than other locations due to the deeper depth of the tanks. IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: These improvements to USTs are required by federal law. If they are not accomplished by the established deadline, the base will be in violation of the law and may begin receiving notices of violation, fines, and possible litigation. Undetected tank failures may result in contamination of soil and potable water supplies, resulting							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION MALMSTROM AIR FORCE BASE, MONTANA		
4. PROJECT TITLE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS MINUTEMAN II FACILITIES	5. PROJECT NUMBER NZAS932500	
<p>in a threat to human health and well being and extremely costly cleanup measures.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements". Project has been considered for FY97 force structure end strength.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION MALMSTROM AIR FORCE BASE, MONTANA																								
4. PROJECT TITLE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS MINUTEMAN II FACILITIES	5. PROJECT NUMBER NZAS932500																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="346 625 1412 758"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 DEC 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>93 JAN 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 SEP 20</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="346 821 1329 884"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="346 947 1412 1108"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>85</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>65</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>150</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>120</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>30</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 DEC 15	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	93 JAN 15	(d) Date Design Complete	93 SEP 20	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	85	(b) All Other Design Costs	65	(c) Total	150	(d) Contract	120	(e) In-house	30
(a) Date Design Started	92 DEC 15																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	93 JAN 15																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 SEP 20																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	85																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	65																							
(c) Total	150																							
(d) Contract	120																							
(e) In-house	30																							

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)							2. DATE		
AIR FORCE											
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION					4. COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX			
OFFUTT AIR FORCE BASE, NEBRASKA					AIR COMBAT COMMAND			0.99			
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			TOTAL
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	
a. As of 30 SEP 92		2122	7500	1326		58					11,006
b. End FY 1998		1975	6900	1276		58					10,209
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (4,006)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)											422,293
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:											16,940
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:											11,000
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)											10,400
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:											37,400
g. Remaining Deficiency:											0
h. Grand Total:											498,033
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE			SCOPE	COST (\$000)	DESIGN STATUS				
CODE							START	Cmpl			
111-111	REPAIR AIRFIELD PAVEMENTS AND LIGHTING			76,000 SY	8,700	JUL 92	MAY 93				
811-147	ADD TO EMERGENCY BACK-UP POWER			3,000 KW	2,300	AUG 92	MAY 93				
					TOTAL:	11,000					
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995)											
124-135	REPLACE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS			74 EA	5,000						
219-943	BCE VEHICLE READINESS FACILITY			29,600 SF	4,400						
871-183	STORM DRAINAGE FACILITIES			LS	1,000						
					TOTAL:	10,400					
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
110-000	UPGRADE APRON AND TAXIWAYS			LS	5,800						
121-124	UPGRADE JET FUEL PUMPING FACILITY			LS	3,300						
121-124	UPGRADE HYDRANT FUEL PUMPING SYSTEM			LS	18,600						
442-758	WAREHOUSE			20,000 SF	2,500						
813-000	UPGRADE ELECTRIC SUBSTATION			LS	5,700						
10. Mission or Major Functions: Headquarters United States Strategic Command; a flying wing which consists of two reconnaissance squadrons (RC-135 aircraft), two airborne command and control squadrons (E-4 and EX-135 aircraft) which maintain a modified alert posture, and an airlift detachment (C-21 aircraft); an intelligence wing; Air Force Global Weather Central; and a USAF regional hospital.											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:											0
b. Water pollution:											1,000
c. Occupational safety and health:											0
d. Other Environmental:											0

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE			
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION OFFUTT AIR FORCE BASE, NEBRASKA				4. PROJECT TITLE REPAIR AIRFIELD PAVEMENTS AND LIGHTING				
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 1.18.96C		6. CATEGORY CODE 111-111	7. PROJECT NUMBER SGBP930909		8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 8,700			
9. COST ESTIMATES								
ITEM					U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
REPAIR AIRFIELD PAVEMENTS AND LIGHTING					LS			5,947
UPGRADE PAVEMENTS					SY	76,000	67	(5,092)
EDGE DRAINS					LF	13,900	4	(56)
REPLACE APPROACH/THRESHOLD LIGHTING					LS			(799)
SUPPORTING FACILITIES								1,530
SITE IMPROVEMENTS					LS			(530)
DEMOLITION/CONCRETE REMOVAL					CY	50,000	20	(1,000)
SUBTOTAL								7,477
CONTINGENCY (10%)								748
TOTAL CONTRACT COST								8,225
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)								494
TOTAL REQUEST								8,719
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)								8,700
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Work necessary for renovation of airfield. Includes replacement of 6,800 LF of center section of runway, grooving, patching, sealing joints and cracks, striping, asphalt replacement, and edge drains. Includes demolition of abandoned runway and construction of blast pad. Includes repair of waterline under runway and replacement of approach/threshold lighting system. All necessary support.								
11. REQUIREMENT: As required. PROJECT: Upgrade airfield pavements and lighting. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: Adequate runway, taxiways and apron pavements to accommodate continuous use by KC/EC/RC-135 and E-4 aircraft. All pavements must be adequately constructed and maintained in such condition that hazards to aircraft and crews are not created by deteriorating pavements and pavement debris. Runways, taxiways, and parking aprons must be free from defects which might impede strategic reconnaissance, airborne command post "Looking Glass", National Emergency Airborne Command Post (NEACP), and various command support missions. A state-of-the-art, reliable threshold and approach lighting system is required to provide a visual approach reference to pilots when landing. A jet engine runup pad is required to support transient aircraft. CURRENT SITUATION: The runway keel in each touchdown zone is deteriorating rapidly due to age and continuous heavy use. A 1989 pavement condition survey revealed a Pavement Condition Index (PCI) of less than 25 (VERY POOR) in the south touchdown zone and less than 55 (FAIR) for the balance of the keel section. Even with extensive in-house maintenance and repair efforts, the base has been successful in only returning the PCI in the south touchdown zone to a maximum of 45 (FAIR), with an estimated PCI of 10 (FAILED) or less within 5 years. Portions of								

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION OFFUTT AIR FORCE BASE, NEBRASKA		
4. PROJECT TITLE REPAIR AIRFIELD PAVEMENTS AND LIGHTING	5. PROJECT NUMBER SGBP930909	
<p>taxiways and aprons are equally bad and require selective replacement. Upgrade of other airfield areas during runway closure is necessary to minimize future impacts on the flying mission. Repair of a leaking water main which crosses under the north end of the runway is necessary to preclude further damage to the runway subbase. Relocation of this main away from the runway is not feasible due to the topography north of the airfield. The Visual Approach Slope Indicator (VASI) system is obsolete and will be replaced by a Precision Approach Path Indicator (PAPI) system. The VASI is old and unreliable and requires excessive maintenance and repair. It is increasingly difficult to support due to nonavailability of parts. The water main and approach/threshold lighting work is not directly associated with the runway work itself; however, this work would require runway closure if accomplished separately. Therefore, it is both practical and cost effective to include this work in this project. The demolition and removal of an abandoned runway is also necessary as this pavement is near the active runway and has deteriorated to the point that it has become a constant FOD problem.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Continued runway deterioration will result in closure of the runway and relocation of the base mission. The base mission cannot be accomplished if the runway becomes excessively rough or becomes a source of debris which results in foreign object damage to aircraft or creates a hazard to aircraft or crews. Permanent relocation of critical base flying missions (reconnaissance, airborne command post, and NEACP) would be extremely costly due to the special ground support needs and functions associated with mission execution. Failure to provide modern and reliable lighting systems will jeopardize mission execution and the safety of aircrews during night landing operations.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> A preliminary analysis of reasonable options for accomplishing this project was done. It indicates there is only one option that satisfies mission requirements. Because of this, a full economic analysis was not performed. A certificate of exclusion has been prepared. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements".</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																																													
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION OFFUTT AIR FORCE BASE, NEBRASKA																																															
4. PROJECT TITLE REPAIR AIRFIELD PAVEMENTS AND LIGHTING	5. PROJECT NUMBER SGBP930909																																														
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td colspan="3">(1) Status:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td></td> <td>92 JUL 25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td></td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td></td> <td>92 NOV 23</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td></td> <td>93 MAY 26</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(2) Basis:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td></td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td></td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td></td> <td>420</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td></td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td></td> <td>495</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> <td>25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td></td> <td>470</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(4) Construction Start</td> <td></td> <td>93 DEC</td> </tr> </table> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(1) Status:			(a) Date Design Started		92 JUL 25	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%	(c) Date 35% Designed		92 NOV 23	(d) Date Design Complete		93 MAY 26	(2) Basis:			(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A	(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)			(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		420	(b) All Other Design Costs		75	(c) Total		495	(d) Contract		25	(e) In-house		470	(4) Construction Start		93 DEC
(1) Status:																																															
(a) Date Design Started		92 JUL 25																																													
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%																																													
(c) Date 35% Designed		92 NOV 23																																													
(d) Date Design Complete		93 MAY 26																																													
(2) Basis:																																															
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO																																													
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A																																													
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)																																															
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		420																																													
(b) All Other Design Costs		75																																													
(c) Total		495																																													
(d) Contract		25																																													
(e) In-house		470																																													
(4) Construction Start		93 DEC																																													

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)				2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION OFFUTT AIR FORCE BASE, NEBRASKA			4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO EMERGENCY BACK-UP POWER				
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 1.18.96C		6. CATEGORY CODE 811-147	7. PROJECT NUMBER SGBP900909		8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 2,300		
9. COST ESTIMATES							
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)		
ADD TO EMERGENCY BACK-UP POWER		LS			2,040		
DIESEL GEN W/ACCESSORIES		KW	3,000	420	(1,260)		
ADDITION TO EXISTING POWER PLANT		SF	4,000	110	(440)		
MECHANICAL ALTERATIONS		LS			(180)		
ELECTRICAL ALTERATIONS		LS			(160)		
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					50		
FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEMS		LS			(10)		
UTILITIES		LS			(40)		
SUBTOTAL					2,090		
CONTINGENCY (5%)					105		
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					2,195		
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					132		
TOTAL REQUEST					2,327		
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					2,300		
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Construct addition to power plant matching existing construction. Install one 3.0 MW diesel driven generator set with all accessories and connect to existing system. Includes additional cooling tower capability, relocation of waste lube-oil tank and storm drains, and substation modification. Includes all necessary support.							
11. REQUIREMENT: As required. PROJECT: Construct addition to emergency power generator plant. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: Emergency backup power capability to support a 13,550 KW connected load. Adequate backup power to support critical command and control functions including the STRATCOM command post, Air Force Global Weather, the HQ Space Command Processing Correlation Center, and functions associated with reconnaissance and intelligence gathering missions. The emergency power requirement has been reevaluated in view of changes in the Air Force command structure and is valid as proposed by this project. CURRENT SITUATION: The existing power plant consists of three 650 KW and three 3.0 MW generator sets. The connected emergency power load is 123% of generator capacity. To prevent surge overloads and automatic plant shutdown, it is necessary to selectively and slowly bring the full load on line following a commercial power outage. Plant loading increases to 170% if one of the three large 3.0 MW generators is down for maintenance. The installation of one 3.0 MW generator set will provide capacity for the existing load. This project adds emergency power production capacity to support demands which have evolved since the plant was last upgraded years ago. This includes major new critical power demands to support missions such as the STRATCOM Command Post and the HQ Space Command Mission							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION OFFUTT AIR FORCE BASE, NEBRASKA		
4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO EMERGENCY BACK-UP POWER	5. PROJECT NUMBER SGBP900909	
<p>Processing and Correlation Center. Normal administrative functions are not included as a part of the emergency power load supported in this project. As a secondary benefit to the base, this plant is also used to provide supplemental power to the base electrical distribution system during periods of high demand (i.e., summer air conditioning loads). This practice results in a \$500K to \$750K net annual savings on the base utility bill by reducing the peak demands metered by the local utility company. These demands are used as the basis for future rate structures.</p> <p>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: The existing six emergency generator units cannot provide the required support. Delays will occur in bringing functions "on-line" during a commercial power outage. If an outage occurs while one generator unit is down for maintenance, some critical requirements will be unsupportable and operations requiring power will cease. Under best case conditions, such events will disrupt and delay command and control functions. Under worst case conditions, command and control of National Defense resources could be affected with significant implications on the readiness of defense systems.</p> <p>ADDITIONAL: An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of new construction, revitalization, leasing, and status quo operation. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, new construction was found to be the most cost efficient over the life of the project. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements".</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																																													
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION OFFUTT AIR FORCE BASE, NEBRASKA																																															
4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO EMERGENCY BACK-UP POWER	5. PROJECT NUMBER SGBP900909																																														
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td colspan="3">(1) Status:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td></td> <td>92 AUG 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td></td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td></td> <td>92 NOV 20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td></td> <td>93 MAY 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(2) Basis:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td></td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td></td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td></td> <td>138</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td></td> <td>69</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td></td> <td>207</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> <td>45</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td></td> <td>162</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(4) Construction Start</td> <td></td> <td>93 DEC</td> </tr> </table> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(1) Status:			(a) Date Design Started		92 AUG 15	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%	(c) Date 35% Designed		92 NOV 20	(d) Date Design Complete		93 MAY 15	(2) Basis:			(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A	(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)			(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		138	(b) All Other Design Costs		69	(c) Total		207	(d) Contract		45	(e) In-house		162	(4) Construction Start		93 DEC
(1) Status:																																															
(a) Date Design Started		92 AUG 15																																													
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%																																													
(c) Date 35% Designed		92 NOV 20																																													
(d) Date Design Complete		93 MAY 15																																													
(2) Basis:																																															
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO																																													
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A																																													
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)																																															
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		138																																													
(b) All Other Design Costs		69																																													
(c) Total		207																																													
(d) Contract		45																																													
(e) In-house		162																																													
(4) Construction Start		93 DEC																																													

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)							2. DATE		
AIR FORCE											
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION					4. COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX			
NELLIS AIR FORCE BASE, NEVADA					AIR COMBAT COMMAND			1.10			
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	TOTAL
a. As of 30 SEP 92		792	5421	975	100						7,288
b. End FY 1998		823	5949	1047	100						7,919
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (24,419)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)										357,970	
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:										31,580	
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:										1,650	
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)										4,100	
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:										19,931	
g. Remaining Deficiency:										0	
h. Grand Total:										415,231	
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE			SCOPE		COST (\$000)		DESIGN STATUS		
CODE									START		CMPL
411-135		UPGRADE POL TANKS			LS		1,650		SEP 92		FEB 93
							TOTAL:		1,650		
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995)											
113-321		BOMBER LIVE ORDNANCE LOADING APRON			49,100 SY		4,100				
							TOTAL:		4,100		
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
113-321		AIRCRAFT LOADING APRON			18,300 SY		3,050				
126-926		LIQUID FUEL UNLOADING STAND			LS		470				
141-456		OPERATIONS FACILITY			4,000 SF		3,244				
211-183		SOUND SUPPRESSOR SUPPORT FACILITY			1 EA		850				
890-187		AIRFIELD LIGHTING VAULT			3,500 SF		1,900				
10. Mission or Major Functions: USAF Fighter Weapons Center; a flying wing that includes the Weapons School (F-15 and F-16 aircraft), an adversary training squadron (Red Flag), a test group (A-10, F-15, and F-16 aircraft), the USAF Air Demonstration Squadron (Thunderbirds), and a combat air rescue squadron (MH-60 helicopters); and a joint training group (Air Warrior).											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:										0	
b. Water pollution:										4,900	
c. Occupational safety and health:										0	
d. Other Environmental:										0	

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)				2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION NELLIS AIR FORCE BASE, NEVADA			4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE POL TANKS				
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 2.74.56		6. CATEGORY CODE 411-135	7. PROJECT NUMBER RKMF943004		8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 1,650		
9. COST ESTIMATES							
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)		
UPGRADE POL TANKS		LS			1,353		
REPAIR 15000 BBL STORAGE TANK		EA	1	459,000	(459)		
UPGRADE/REPAIR FUEL TANKS		EA	3	195,000	(585)		
UPGRADE PIPING		LF	1,500	115	(173)		
SITE REMEDIATION		CY	340	400	(136)		
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					70		
UTILITIES		LS			(35)		
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(35)		
SUBTOTAL					1,423		
CONTINGENCY (10%)					142		
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					1,565		
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					94		
TOTAL REQUEST					1,659		
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					1,650		
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Work includes repair to bulk storage tank #30 and existing liquid fuel storage tanks. Remove and repair piping and all supporting systems. Provide all utilities and support as required.							
11. REQUIREMENT: As required. PROJECT: Repair/upgrade existing fuel storage tanks and provide all supporting systems. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: This is a Level I environmental compliance project. Adequate jet fuel storage and related support facilities are required for the receipt, storage, distribution, and dispensing of fuel products. The repairs and upgrade to bulk fuel storage, and related piping systems are required to eliminate further tank and piping leaks and to meet environmental compliance requirements of 40 CFR 112.7, and Nevada Revised Statute 459.850 which regulate releases of pollutants to the soil, ground and/or surface water. CURRENT SITUATION: The liquid fuel storage area consists of four above ground tanks constructed in the 1950's. These tanks hold a total of 3,025,000 gallons of fuel (JP-4). The storage area has been assessed under the Installation Restoration Program (IRP). The assessment was undertaken due to an expanding plume of fuel in an underground aquifer, and deficiencies in the containment berm noted in a March 1991 environmental compliance report. Leak testing conducted on Tank #30 indicated that the tank leaked. Ground water monitor wells in the area also indicate tank leakage has occurred. Tank #30 has been taken out of service. Additionally, the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection advised the installation in a 5 March 1992 letter, that the bottoms of tanks #20, 21, and 29 should be replaced as well because they pose an							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION NELLIS AIR FORCE BASE, NEVADA		
4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE POL TANKS	5. PROJECT NUMBER RKMF943004	
<p>imminent and substantial hazard to the environment (NRS 459.850). <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> The tank farm may be subject to greater regulatory scrutiny because it is located on an Installation Restoration Program (IRP) site. Although regulators have not cited the facility, the potential exists for regulators to declare the facility in violation of a number of environmental regulations. Failure to take corrective action will result in storage tanks which do not meet Federal and State regulatory requirements. <u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide".</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION NELLIS AIR FORCE BASE, NEVADA																								
4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE POL TANKS	5. PROJECT NUMBER RKMF943004																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="353 621 1414 747"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 SEP 10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 OCT 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 FEB 30</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="353 814 1323 877"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="353 940 1414 1098"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>67</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>65</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>132</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>92</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>40</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 SEP 10	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 OCT 15	(d) Date Design Complete	93 FEB 30	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	67	(b) All Other Design Costs	65	(c) Total	132	(d) Contract	92	(e) In-house	40
(a) Date Design Started	92 SEP 10																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 OCT 15																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 FEB 30																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	67																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	65																							
(c) Total	132																							
(d) Contract	92																							
(e) In-house	40																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)					2. DATE				
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION CANNON AIR FORCE BASE, NEW MEXICO				4. COMMAND AIR COMBAT COMMAND		5. AREA CONST COST INDEX 1.10					
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED				
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	TOTAL
a. As of 30 SEP 92		541	4178	460	32	17	4	1	1		5,234
b. End FY 1998		543	4501	498	32	17	4	1	1		5,597
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (3,818)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)										182,312	
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:										4,100	
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:										8,915	
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)										0	
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:										21,900	
g. Remaining Deficiency:										0	
h. Grand Total:										217,227	
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE			SCOPE		COST (\$000)		DESIGN STATUS		
CODE									START Cmpl		
116-665		SOUND SUPPRESSOR SUPPORT PAD			1 EA		665		JUN 92 JUL 93		
179-511		FIRE TRAINING FACILITY			1 EA		1,000		MAY 92 JUL 93		
411-135		UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS			LS		1,100		SEP 92 JAN 94		
610-127		BASE ENGINEERING COMPLEX			65,950 SF		6,150		MAY 92 DEC 93		
							TOTAL:		8,915		
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995) NONE											
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
149-962		CONTROL TOWER			1 EA		2,500				
211-177		SMALL ACFT MAINTENANCE DOCK			28,000 SF		5,000				
211-177		SMALL AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE DOCK			20,500 SF		4,600				
721-312		ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORY			140 PN		4,900				
880-232		FOAM FIRE SYSTEM			LS		4,900				
10. Mission or Major Functions: A fighter wing which includes three F-111 fighter squadrons, a fighter training squadron responsible for training all F-111 aircrews, and an electronic combat squadron (EF-111 aircraft).											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:										0	
b. Water pollution:										7,500	
c. Occupational safety and health:										0	
d. Other Environmental:										0	

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)				2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION CANNON AIR FORCE BASE, NEW MEXICO				4. PROJECT TITLE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 2.74.56C		6. CATEGORY CODE 411-135	7. PROJECT NUMBER CZQZ943003		8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 1,100		
9. COST ESTIMATES							
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)		
UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS		EA	38	23,890	908		
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					40		
PAVEMENTS		LS			(20)		
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(20)		
SUBTOTAL					948		
CONTINGENCY (10%)					95		
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					1,043		
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					62		
TOTAL REQUEST					1,106		
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					1,100		
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Excavate 38 underground storage tanks (USTs) of 150-10,000 gallon capacity. Remove and dispose of tank sludge residue. Replace 33 with vaulted tanks. Project includes release prevention and detection, corrosion protection, site improvements, paving, remediation of contamination, and other necessary support.							
11. REQUIREMENT: As required. <u>PROJECT:</u> Remove/replace underground storage tanks (USTs). (Current Mission) <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> This is a level II environmental compliance project. Adequate fuel storage, properly designed and located, is required to satisfy base mission requirements. All petroleum dispensing and operating facilities must be provided with a means for detecting and preventing release of pollutants into the surrounding environment. All USTs must be upgraded in accordance with federal law (40 CFR 280.21) by December 1998. This includes leak detection, corrosion protection, and spill/overflow prevention systems to protect human health and the environment. <u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> Underground storage tanks at Cannon AFB do not meet federal requirements for corrosion protection, secondary containment, and overflow/spill protection. The condition of these tanks varies with a majority of the tanks at or exceeding their design life. These deficiencies must be corrected to prevent violation of federal UST regulations. If underground storage tanks require replacement, Air Force policy is to replace them with aboveground tanks or relocate them into underground vaults, whenever possible. <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Undetected UST releases can result in contamination of soil and ground water supplies, resulting in a threat to human health and the environment, along with extremely costly cleanup							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION CANNON AIR FORCE BASE, NEW MEXICO		
4. PROJECT TITLE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	5. PROJECT NUMBER CZQZ943003	
<p>measures. These improvements to USTs are mandated by federal law. If not accomplished by the established deadline, the base will be in violation of the law and subject to receiving Notices of Violation, fines, and significant adverse publicity.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements."</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION CANNON AIR FORCE BASE, NEW MEXICO																								
4. PROJECT TITLE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	5. PROJECT NUMBER CZQZ943003																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="351 625 1400 751"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 SEP 30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>15%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 NOV 25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>94 JAN 18</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="351 814 1318 877"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="351 940 1400 1098"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>66</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>22</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>88</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>66</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>22</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 APR</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 SEP 30	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	15%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 NOV 25	(d) Date Design Complete	94 JAN 18	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	66	(b) All Other Design Costs	22	(c) Total	88	(d) Contract	66	(e) In-house	22
(a) Date Design Started	92 SEP 30																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	15%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 NOV 25																							
(d) Date Design Complete	94 JAN 18																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	66																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	22																							
(c) Total	88																							
(d) Contract	66																							
(e) In-house	22																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)				2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION CANNON AIR FORCE BASE, NEW MEXICO			4. PROJECT TITLE BASE ENGINEERING COMPLEX				
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 2.75.96C		6. CATEGORY CODE 610-127	7. PROJECT NUMBER CZQZ913098		8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 6,150		
9. COST ESTIMATES							
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)		
BASE ENGINEERING COMPLEX		SF	66,250		4,605		
BASE ENGINEER MANAGEMENT/DISASTER PREP		SF	20,700	100	(2,070)		
BASE ENGINEER COVERED STORAGE		SF	17,900	50	(895)		
EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL		SF	4,750	80	(380)		
ADD/ALT MAINTENANCE FACILITY		SF	22,900	55	(1,260)		
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					940		
SITE IMPROVEMENTS & PAVEMENTS		LS			(250)		
DEMOLISH BUILDINGS & ASBESTOS REMOVAL		SF	50,000	10	(500)		
UTILITIES		LS			(190)		
SUBTOTAL					5,545		
CONTINGENCY (5%)					277		
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					5,822		
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					349		
TOTAL REQUEST					6,171		
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					6,150		
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Concrete foundations, structural steel frames, masonry walls, and sloped roofs. Management area includes offices, conference room, vault storage, and design section. A Contractor Operated Civil Engineer Supply Store (COCESS) is included for covered storage. Asbestos must be removed before demolition. Air Conditioning: 65 Tons.							
11. REQUIREMENT: 90,075 SF ADEQUATE: 16,939 SF SUBSTANDARD: 84,915 SF PROJECT: Construct a base civil engineering complex. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: Adequate base engineer management and covered storage facilities are required to develop, program, and execute requirements to maintain, repair, operate, and construct facilities, pavements, and utility systems in support of the flying mission. Disaster Preparedness requires adequate space to provide planning, management, training, and operations to prepare all personnel to protect Air Force resources from the effects of attacks and/or disaster situations, restore primary mission assets, and fulfill humanitarian disaster relief responsibilities. Adequate space is required for Explosive Ordnance to perform services on explosives hazardous to operations, facilities, personnel or material. Adequate maintenance facilities are required to support personnel of all trades, to maintain and operate facilities, pavements, and utility systems in support of the base mission. CURRENT SITUATION: The Civil Engineering functions are presently housed in wood-frame WWII structures and are the first facilities observed by visitors to the base. These facilities are deteriorated and are inadequately heated and cooled. Foundations are failing causing excessive differential settlement. This has resulted in load bearing walls being up to two inches lower than the center of the room. Windows are popping out,							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION CANNON AIR FORCE BASE, NEW MEXICO		
4. PROJECT TITLE BASE ENGINEERING COMPLEX	5. PROJECT NUMBER CZQZ913098	
<p>and those that stay in are difficult to open or close. The rafter systems are buckling in the roofs causing a "sway back" condition. Wood floors have asbestos tile and are deteriorated which allows small animals into the buildings. Two major facilities were not upgraded since construction in 1944, except for limited fire protection. The room that contains all base facility drawings has no fire protection. A serious fire hazard is created due to an outdated electrical system in this area. The configuration and layout of these facilities has produced a nonfunctional interior arrangement of work areas which hampers communication and productivity. The Air Force has directed Disaster Preparedness and Explosive Ordnance Disposal be incorporated as a functional organization within Civil Engineering. These functions are located in outdated and poorly configured facilities in another area of the installation which further complicates the separation of functions and hampers communication and productivity at the same time reductions in manpower necessitate greater efficiency and productivity. This project demolishes 50,142 SF of substandard space.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> The Civil Engineering organization will be forced to occupy unsafe, inefficient, and inadequate facilities with functions being geographically separated. The resulting lower productivity potential of this setup adversely affects Cannon's flying mission since the base is heavily dependent upon Civil Engineering's support.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide." However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements." An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of new construction, revitalization, leasing and status quo operation. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, new construction was found to be the most cost efficient over the life of the project.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																																													
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION CANNON AIR FORCE BASE, NEW MEXICO																																															
4. PROJECT TITLE BASE ENGINEERING COMPLEX	5. PROJECT NUMBER CZQZ913098																																														
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td colspan="3">(1) Status:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td></td> <td>92 MAY 27</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td></td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td></td> <td>92 SEP 14</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td></td> <td>93 DEC 16</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(2) Basis:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td></td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td></td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td></td> <td>260</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td></td> <td>98</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td></td> <td>358</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> <td>260</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td></td> <td>98</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(4) Construction Start</td> <td></td> <td>94 FEB</td> </tr> </table> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(1) Status:			(a) Date Design Started		92 MAY 27	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%	(c) Date 35% Designed		92 SEP 14	(d) Date Design Complete		93 DEC 16	(2) Basis:			(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A	(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)			(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		260	(b) All Other Design Costs		98	(c) Total		358	(d) Contract		260	(e) In-house		98	(4) Construction Start		94 FEB
(1) Status:																																															
(a) Date Design Started		92 MAY 27																																													
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%																																													
(c) Date 35% Designed		92 SEP 14																																													
(d) Date Design Complete		93 DEC 16																																													
(2) Basis:																																															
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO																																													
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A																																													
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)																																															
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		260																																													
(b) All Other Design Costs		98																																													
(c) Total		358																																													
(d) Contract		260																																													
(e) In-house		98																																													
(4) Construction Start		94 FEB																																													

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)						2. DATE			
AIR FORCE											
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION						4. COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX		
HOLLOMAN AIR FORCE BASE, NEW MEXICO						AIR COMBAT COMMAND			1.01		
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			TOTAL
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	
a. As of 30 SEP 92		555	4031	976	181	150	12	7	8	61	5,981
b. End FY 1998		549	3993	1019	181	150	12	7	8	61	5,980
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (58,565)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)		276,483									
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:		84,030									
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:		9,200									
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)		3,900									
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:		26,190									
g. Remaining Deficiency:		0									
h. Grand Total:		399,803									
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE		SCOPE		COST (\$000)		DESIGN STATUS			
CODE								START		CMPL	
411-135		UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS		LS		1,000		NOV 92		AUG 93	
721-312		ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES		296 PN		6,400		JUN 92		OCT 93	
832-266		SEWER EFFLUENT SYSTEM		LS		1,800		JUN 92		JUN 93	
		TOTAL:				9,200					
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995)											
721-312		ALTER DORMITORY		126 PN		3,900					
		TOTAL:				3,900					
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
112-211		TAXIWAY		25,750 SY		1,540					
130-142		FIRE/CRASH RESCUE STATION		5,700 SF		1,300					
315-944		ADD TO AND ALTER WEAPON GUIDANCE LABORATORY		3,950 SF		1,150					
721-312		ALTER UNACCOMPANIED ENLISTED HSG		250 PN		6,900					
842-245		UPGRADE UTILITIES, PHASE II		123,000 LF		5,200					
10. Mission or Major Functions: A fighter wing with three F-117 squadrons one of which is responsible for training all F-117 aircrews, a fighter training group with two AT-38 squadrons, and a combat air rescue detachment (MH-60 helicopters); a mobility support squadron (maintains the Harvest Base kit); an Air Force Materiel Command test group; a German Air Force fighter training squadron (F-4 aircraft); and an Air National Guard fighter interceptor detachment (F-16 aircraft).											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:		0									
b. Water pollution:		0									
c. Occupational safety and health:		0									
d. Other Environmental:		0									

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)				2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION HOLLOMAN AIR FORCE BASE, NEW MEXICO			4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES				
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 2.75.96C		6. CATEGORY CODE 721-312	7. PROJECT NUMBER KWRD933014		8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 6,400		
9. COST ESTIMATES							
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)		
ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES (296 PN)		SF	58,200		4,599		
ALTERATION		SF	49,600	83	(4,117)		
ADDITION		SF	8,600	56	(482)		
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					890		
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(25)		
PAVEMENTS		LS			(225)		
ASBESTOS REMOVAL		SF	49,600	6	(300)		
COMMUNICATIONS SUPPORT		LS			(130)		
UTILITIES		LS			(210)		
SUBTOTAL					5,489		
CONTINGENCY (10%)					549		
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					6,038		
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					362		
TOTAL REQUEST					6,400		
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					6,400		
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Alteration of structural, mechanical, and electrical systems including, installation of exterior balconies for entrances to each room; installation of room-bath-room modules; noise attenuation, and asbestos removal. Prewire each room for telephone and cable television. Install new lounge, laundry, and storage areas. Includes all utilities and necessary support. Air Conditioning: 165 Tons. Grade Mix: 296 E1-E4.							
11. REQUIREMENT: 2,068 PN ADEQUATE: 1,196 PN SUBSTANDARD: 676 PN PROJECT: Add to and alter dormitories. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: A major Air Force objective is to provide unaccompanied enlisted personnel with housing that will be conducive to their proper rest, relaxation, safety, and personal well-being. Properly designed and furnished quarters, which provide some degree of individual privacy, are essential to successfully accomplish the increasingly complicated and critical jobs these people must perform supporting the base mission. CURRENT SITUATION: These dormitories have received no major upgrades since originally constructed over thirty years ago to standards in effect at the time. These facilities lack privacy and adequate living space per occupant. The dormitories have obsolete electrical and mechanical systems and inadequate lighting, insulation and sound attenuation. The existing fire detection systems do not meet the current standards as set forth in the NFPA Life Safety Code. Before the upgrade, the dormitories will house 288 personnel and after the upgrade will house 296 personnel. This project exceeds 70 percent of the facility replacement cost; however, the economic analysis supports and justifies the decision to add to and alter the existing facility. IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: Substandard living conditions will continue to							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION HOLLOMAN AIR FORCE BASE, NEW MEXICO		
4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES	5. PROJECT NUMBER KWRD933014	
<p>degrade the morale, productivity and career satisfaction of the enlisted force. Obsolete mechanical and electrical systems, inadequate laundry facilities, insufficient lounge and storage areas will continue to interfere with required rest, relaxation and comfort of dorm residents. Efforts by dorm residents to accomplish daily routine housekeeping requirements will become more difficult as dorms continue to deteriorate resulting in further demoralization of the residents.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> This project meets the criteria/scope specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide." An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of new construction, revitalization, leasing and status quo operation. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, revitalization was found to be the most cost efficient over the life of the project.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																																													
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION HOLLOMAN AIR FORCE BASE, NEW MEXICO																																															
4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES	5. PROJECT NUMBER KWRD933014																																														
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td colspan="3">(1) Status:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td></td> <td>92 JUN 18</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td></td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td></td> <td>92 SEP 18</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td></td> <td>93 OCT 26</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(2) Basis:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td></td> <td>YES</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td></td> <td>HOLLOMAN</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td></td> <td>145</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td></td> <td>110</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td></td> <td>255</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> <td>65</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td></td> <td>190</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(4) Construction Start</td> <td></td> <td>94 JAN</td> </tr> </table> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(1) Status:			(a) Date Design Started		92 JUN 18	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%	(c) Date 35% Designed		92 SEP 18	(d) Date Design Complete		93 OCT 26	(2) Basis:			(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		YES	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		HOLLOMAN	(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)			(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		145	(b) All Other Design Costs		110	(c) Total		255	(d) Contract		65	(e) In-house		190	(4) Construction Start		94 JAN
(1) Status:																																															
(a) Date Design Started		92 JUN 18																																													
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%																																													
(c) Date 35% Designed		92 SEP 18																																													
(d) Date Design Complete		93 OCT 26																																													
(2) Basis:																																															
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		YES																																													
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		HOLLOMAN																																													
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)																																															
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		145																																													
(b) All Other Design Costs		110																																													
(c) Total		255																																													
(d) Contract		65																																													
(e) In-house		190																																													
(4) Construction Start		94 JAN																																													

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)				2. DATE		
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION HOLLOMAN AIR FORCE BASE, NEW MEXICO				4. PROJECT TITLE SEWER EFFLUENT SYSTEM				
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 2.74.56C		6. CATEGORY CODE 832-266	7. PROJECT NUMBER KWRD943012		8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 1,800			
9. COST ESTIMATES								
ITEM					U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
SEWER EFFLUENT SYSTEM					LF	22,900	66	1,511
SUPPORTING FACILITIES								95
DEMOLITION					LS			(85)
SITE WORK					LS			(10)
SUBTOTAL								1,606
CONTINGENCY (5%)								80
TOTAL CONTRACT COST								1,686
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)								101
TOTAL REQUEST								1,787
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)								1,800
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Install 8" sewer pipeline, concrete manholes with cast iron covers, and lift stations. Demolition and removal along with disposal of existing septic tanks is required.								
11. REQUIREMENT: As required. <u>PROJECT:</u> Install a sewer effluent system. (Current Mission) <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> This is a Level II environmental compliance project. An adequate sewer effluent system is required to replace the existing septic tanks at the Test Track Area of Holloman AFB, NM. The system is required to convey industrial waste and sewage to the base treatment plant. The system will meet state and federal regulations for wastewater effluent. <u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> Wastewater and industrial waste are collected at the Test Track Area and fed into septic tank systems. These systems drain into leachfields in the vicinity of the Lost River, which is a known natural habitat of the endangered Pupfish. <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> The existing septic system results in the introduction of contaminants into a protected species habitat. Although regulators have not cited the installation, the potential exists for regulators to enforce environmental quality regulations associated with the Endangered Species Act, which could result in mandated restoration like that currently underway at the installation's sewage lagoon. <u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements".								

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION HOLLOMAN AIR FORCE BASE, NEW MEXICO																								
4. PROJECT TITLE SEWER EFFLUENT SYSTEM	5. PROJECT NUMBER KWRD943012																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="346 609 1404 756"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 JUN 18</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 SEP 17</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 JUN 01</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="346 798 1321 882"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="346 924 1404 1102"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>47</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>126</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>173</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>47</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>126</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 JUN 18	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 SEP 17	(d) Date Design Complete	93 JUN 01	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	47	(b) All Other Design Costs	126	(c) Total	173	(d) Contract	47	(e) In-house	126
(a) Date Design Started	92 JUN 18																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 SEP 17																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 JUN 01																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	47																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	126																							
(c) Total	173																							
(d) Contract	47																							
(e) In-house	126																							

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)							2. DATE		
AIR FORCE											
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION					4. COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX			
KIRTLAND AIR FORCE BASE, NEW MEXICO					AIR FORCE			0.92			
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH					PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED
					OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	TOTAL
a. As of 30 SEP 92					1227	3213	2249	101	262	101	7,532
b. End FY 1998					1350	2850	2321	101	262	101	7,364
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (44,025)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92) 417,715											
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory: 14,800											
d. Authorization Requested In This Program: 27,061											
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995) 15,600											
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years: 74,690											
g. Remaining Deficiency: 0											
h. Grand Total: 549,866											
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE		SCOPE		COST (\$000)		DESIGN STATUS			
CODE								START		CML	
310-919		AEROSPACE ENGINEERING FACILITY		14,000 SF		3,167		AUG 92		SEP 93	
312-477		SPACE STRUCTURES LABORATORY		31,900 SF		6,200		AUG 92		OCT 93	
312-477		COMPOSITE MATERIALS LABORATORY		30,000 SF		5,750		SEP 92		OCT 93	
721-312		ALTER DORMITORY		280 PN		5,100		OCT 92		OCT 93	
813-231		UPGRADE ELECTRICAL DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM				LS 6,844		JUL 92		SEP 93	
						TOTAL:		27,061			
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995)											
171-212		SIMULATOR TRAINING FACILITY		51,700 SF		9,000					
318-614		SOLAR/ELECTRIC LABORATORY		13,200 SF		2,200					
411-135		IMPROVE JET FUEL STORAGE				LS 4,400					
						TOTAL:		15,600			
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
179-511		FIREMEN TRAINING FACILITY				LS 1,040					
318-614		ALTER EXPLOSIVES STORAGE SITE PHASE II				LS 2,400					
721-312		ALTER UNACCOMPANIED ENLISTED HSG		250 PN		4,000					
740-674		ADD TO AND ALTER PHYSICAL FITNESS CENTER		16,330 SF		1,500					
740-884		CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER		23,000 SF		2,800					
10. Mission or Major Functions: Phillips Laboratory; the Air Force Operational Test and Evaluation Center; an Air Training Command crew training wing with two flying training squadrons (MH-53, TH-53, UH-1, and HH-3 helicopters, and MC-130 and HC-130 aircraft); Air Force Security Police Agency; and an Air National Guard fighter group (F-16 aircraft). Major tenants include Naval Weapons Evaluation Facility and Sandia National Laboratory.											

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)						2. DATE			
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION KIRTLAND AIR FORCE BASE, NEW MEXICO				4. COMMAND AIR FORCE MATERIEL COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX 0.92				
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			TOTAL
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	
a. As of											
b. End FY											
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage:											
b. Inventory Total As Of:											
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:											
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:											
e. Authorization Included In Following Program:											
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:											
g. Remaining Deficiency:											
h. Grand Total:											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:										0	
b. Water pollution:										0	
c. Occupational safety and health:										0	
d. Other Environmental:										0	

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION KIRTLAND AIR FORCE BASE, NEW MEXICO			4. PROJECT TITLE AEROSPACE ENGINEERING FACILITY			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 6.23.02	6. CATEGORY CODE 310-919	7. PROJECT NUMBER MHMV943022	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 3,167			
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
AEROSPACE ENGINEERING FACILITY		SF	16,000	135	2,160	
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					630	
UTILITIES		LS			(270)	
COMMUNICATIONS SUPPORT		LS			(160)	
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(200)	
SUBTOTAL					2,790	
CONTINGENCY (5%)					140	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					2,930	
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (1%)					176	
TOTAL REQUEST					3,106	
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					3,167	
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Construct a laboratory with a high bay (40 feet), bridge crane, special isolation floor slab for the shaker pit, clean room, control room, staging area and loading dock. Provide 750 KVA of electric power, other utilities and necessary support. Air Conditioning: 50 Tons.						
11. REQUIREMENT: 16,000 SF ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 0 PROJECT: Construct an aerospace engineering facility. (New Mission) REQUIREMENT: The facility is required for development, integration, and testing of components and complete space flight payloads. It must be equipped to measure the response of payloads to mechanical vibrations and shock, acceleration, thermal, and thermal-vacuum tests. The researchers and contractors operate integrated payloads in a dress rehearsal of sounding rocket, balloon, and orbiting spacecraft flight. This facility provides a realistic test environment for payloads sent aloft by balloons and rocket boosters. CURRENT SITUATION: Currently, this function is located at Hanscom Air Force Base. The geographic separation from Phillips Lab at Kirtland Air Force Base inhibits the integration of space research experiments. The objective of the Phillips Lab consolidation is to collocate all space research at Kirtland AFB. IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: The ability to execute integrated and timely space experiments will not be possible if this facility is not collocated at Kirtland AFB. ADDITIONAL: There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide" or in Air Force Manual 86-2. All known alternative options were considered during the development of this project. No other option could meet the mission						

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION KIRTLAND AIR FORCE BASE, NEW MEXICO		
4. PROJECT TITLE AEROSPACE ENGINEERING FACILITY	5. PROJECT NUMBER MHMV943022	
<p>requirements besides new construction and consolidation of this facility at Kirtland AFB; therefore, no economic analysis was performed.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION KIRTLAND AIR FORCE BASE, NEW MEXICO																								
4. PROJECT TITLE AEROSPACE ENGINEERING FACILITY	5. PROJECT NUMBER MHMV943022																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="330 609 1404 756"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 AUG 24</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 NOV 04</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 SEP 03</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="330 798 1404 882"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="330 924 1404 1102"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>192</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>103</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>295</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>291</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 JAN</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 AUG 24	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 NOV 04	(d) Date Design Complete	93 SEP 03	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	192	(b) All Other Design Costs	103	(c) Total	295	(d) Contract	4	(e) In-house	291
(a) Date Design Started	92 AUG 24																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 NOV 04																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 SEP 03																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	192																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	103																							
(c) Total	295																							
(d) Contract	4																							
(e) In-house	291																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION KIRTLAND AIR FORCE BASE, NEW MEXICO		4. PROJECT TITLE COMPOSITE MATERIALS LABORATORY		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 6.23.02	6. CATEGORY CODE 312-477	7. PROJECT NUMBER MHMV943017	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 5,750	
9. COST ESTIMATES				
ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
COMPOSITE MATERIALS LABORATORY	SF	30,000	160	4,800
SUPPORTING FACILITIES				345
UTILITIES	LS			(130)
COMMUNICATIONS SUPPORT	LS			(130)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS	LS			(85)
SUBTOTAL				5,145
CONTINGENCY (5%)				257
TOTAL CONTRACT COST				5,402
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)				324
TOTAL REQUEST				5,726
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)				5,750
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Reinforced concrete foundation with special isolation floor slabs. Structural steel frame with a metal deck roofing system; zoned heating, ventilation, and air conditioning system, pre-wired communications systems and EMCS connections. Provide 3000 SF covered storage shelter. Air Conditioning: 75 Tons.				
11. REQUIREMENT: 30,000 SF ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 33,600 SF PROJECT: Construct a composite materials laboratory. (New Mission) REQUIREMENT: Provide laboratory space to conduct research into advanced materials (composites) used for space/missile structures. This facility will house large composite material fabrication equipment, such as filament winding machines, high temperature processing and curing machines, and machines used for non-destructive tests on the fabricated materials. A storage area is needed to store hydrogen, nitrogen, and propane with a pumping system, flare stack, and a cooling tower. CURRENT SITUATION: The existing composite laboratory is located at Edwards AFB, CA. The objective of the Phillips Laboratory consolidation is to collocate all space research facilities at Kirtland AFB. The existing lab was constructed in the early 1960's for NASA to fabricate and test Saturn rocket motors. It has been modified and altered in an effort to make it suitable for composite work. The existing 33,600 square foot facility would require \$3 million worth of repairs to support continued occupancy. IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: The integrated development of space systems will not occur due to the large geographic separation of the laboratory facilities. ADDITIONAL: There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of				

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION KIRTLAND AIR FORCE BASE, NEW MEXICO		
4. PROJECT TITLE COMPOSITE MATERIALS LABORATORY	5. PROJECT NUMBER MHMV943017	
<p>Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide" or in AFM 86-2. All known alternative options were considered during the development of this project. No other option could meet the mission requirements besides consolidation and new construction of this facility at Kirtland Air Force Base; therefore, no economic analysis was performed.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																																													
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION KIRTLAND AIR FORCE BASE, NEW MEXICO																																															
4. PROJECT TITLE COMPOSITE MATERIALS LABORATORY	5. PROJECT NUMBER MHMV943017																																														
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td colspan="3">(1) Status:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td></td> <td>92 SEP 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td></td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td></td> <td>92 DEC 30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td></td> <td>93 OCT 11</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(2) Basis:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td></td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td></td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td></td> <td>354</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td></td> <td>108</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td></td> <td>462</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> <td>54</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td></td> <td>408</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(4) Construction Start</td> <td></td> <td>94 MAR</td> </tr> </table> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(1) Status:			(a) Date Design Started		92 SEP 01	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%	(c) Date 35% Designed		92 DEC 30	(d) Date Design Complete		93 OCT 11	(2) Basis:			(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A	(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)			(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		354	(b) All Other Design Costs		108	(c) Total		462	(d) Contract		54	(e) In-house		408	(4) Construction Start		94 MAR
(1) Status:																																															
(a) Date Design Started		92 SEP 01																																													
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%																																													
(c) Date 35% Designed		92 DEC 30																																													
(d) Date Design Complete		93 OCT 11																																													
(2) Basis:																																															
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO																																													
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A																																													
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)																																															
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		354																																													
(b) All Other Design Costs		108																																													
(c) Total		462																																													
(d) Contract		54																																													
(e) In-house		408																																													
(4) Construction Start		94 MAR																																													

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION KIRTLAND AIR FORCE BASE, NEW MEXICO			4. PROJECT TITLE SPACE STRUCTURES LABORATORY			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 6.23.02	6. CATEGORY CODE 312-477	7. PROJECT NUMBER MHMV943018	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 6,200			
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
SPACE STRUCTURES LABORATORY		SF	31,900	165	5,264	
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					280	
UTILITIES		LS			(120)	
COMMUNICATIONS SUPPORT		LS			(120)	
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(40)	
SUBTOTAL					5,544	
CONTINGENCY (5%)					277	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					5,821	
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					349	
TOTAL REQUEST					6,170	
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					6,200	
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Reinforced concrete foundation with special isolation floor slabs in the laboratory areas, steel structural frame with a stucco/concrete slab exterior finish. Project includes communications pre-wiring, EMCS connections and necessary support. Air Conditioning: 75 Tons.						
11. REQUIREMENT: 31,900 SF ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 0 PROJECT: Construct a space structures laboratory. (New Mission) REQUIREMENT: Provide a facility to support the space structures experiments, which are needed to provide vital information regarding spacecraft structural configuration, control, weight reduction, and structural vibration damping. This research incorporates advanced composite materials into spacecraft and ballistic missile systems. The space structures laboratory must be collocated with the composite materials lab to fulfill the intent of the Phillips Laboratory consolidation. Test equipment that vibrates spacecraft structural experiments needs to be mounted on isolation floor slabs to minimize vibrating other experiments and the rest of the facility. The large size of the test equipment and the tested structural systems requires large lab rooms with high ceilings. CURRENT SITUATION: The existing space structures laboratory is contained in five separate facilities, totaling 44,500 SF at Edwards Air Force Base and 5,859 SF at Kirtland Air Force Base. The existing laboratory facilities at Edwards AFB are approaching 40 years old and have deteriorated with age. The existing laboratories are cramped and improperly configured for experiment control, and are not conducive to sharing technologies between the various disciplines involved in						

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION KIRTLAND AIR FORCE BASE, NEW MEXICO		
4. PROJECT TITLE SPACE STRUCTURES LABORATORY	5. PROJECT NUMBER MHMV943018	
<p>spacecraft structures. The objective of the Phillips Lab consolidation is to collocate all space research facilities at Kirtland AFB.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Spacecraft structural experiments will not be properly integrated if this facility is not collocated with its related technologies. Structural research for such experiments as the Space Based Radar and the Advanced Structure Technology Research Experiment will not occur in a timely and effective manner.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of new construction, revitalization, leasing and status quo operation. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, new construction was found to be the most cost efficient over the life of the project. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide" or in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements".</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																																													
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION KIRTLAND AIR FORCE BASE, NEW MEXICO																																															
4. PROJECT TITLE SPACE STRUCTURES LABORATORY	5. PROJECT NUMBER MHMV943018																																														
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td colspan="3">(1) Status:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td></td> <td>92 AUG 24</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td></td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td></td> <td>92 DEC 04</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td></td> <td>93 OCT 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(2) Basis:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td></td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td></td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td></td> <td>384</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td></td> <td>142</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td></td> <td>526</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> <td>86</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td></td> <td>440</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(4) Construction Start</td> <td></td> <td>94 MAR</td> </tr> </table> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(1) Status:			(a) Date Design Started		92 AUG 24	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%	(c) Date 35% Designed		92 DEC 04	(d) Date Design Complete		93 OCT 15	(2) Basis:			(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A	(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)			(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		384	(b) All Other Design Costs		142	(c) Total		526	(d) Contract		86	(e) In-house		440	(4) Construction Start		94 MAR
(1) Status:																																															
(a) Date Design Started		92 AUG 24																																													
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%																																													
(c) Date 35% Designed		92 DEC 04																																													
(d) Date Design Complete		93 OCT 15																																													
(2) Basis:																																															
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO																																													
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A																																													
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)																																															
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		384																																													
(b) All Other Design Costs		142																																													
(c) Total		526																																													
(d) Contract		86																																													
(e) In-house		440																																													
(4) Construction Start		94 MAR																																													

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)		2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION KIRTLAND AIR FORCE BASE, NEW MEXICO			4. PROJECT TITLE ALTER DORMITORY		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 4.18.96	6. CATEGORY CODE 721-312	7. PROJECT NUMBER MHMV943000	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 5,100		
9. COST ESTIMATES					
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
ALTER DORMITORY (250 PN)		SF	56,000	66	3,696
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					690
UTILITIES		LS			(255)
PAVEMENTS		LS			(225)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(210)
SUBTOTAL					4,386
CONTINGENCY (10%)					439
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					4,825
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					290
TOTAL REQUEST					5,115
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					5,100
10. Description of Proposed Construction: All electrical, mechanical, and structural work necessary to upgrade dorm to acceptable standards of livability. Install semi-private baths, balconies, and improve safety, building maintainability and energy conservation features. Grade Mix: 250 E1-E4.					
11. REQUIREMENT: 1,794 PN ADEQUATE: 1,479 PN SUBSTANDARD: 467 PN PROJECT: Alter dormitory. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: A major Air Force objective is to provide unaccompanied enlisted personnel with housing conducive to their proper rest, relaxation and personal well-being. Properly designed and furnished quarters providing some degree of individual privacy are essential to the successful accomplishment of the increasingly complicated and important jobs these people must perform. CURRENT SITUATION: The existing dormitory is over 40 years old. Inefficiencies include central latrines, inadequate lighting, poor insulation and sound attenuation and obsolete electrical and mechanical systems. Dorm occupancy rate is 100 percent. This is phase four of a five phase program to provide adequate dormitories at Kirtland. IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: Substandard living conditions on base and expensive off-base housing will continue to degrade the morale, productivity and career satisfaction of the enlisted force. ADDITIONAL: An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of new construction, revitalization, leasing and status quo operation. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, revitalization was found to be the most cost efficient over the life of the project. This project meets the criteria/scope specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design"					

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION KIRTLAND AIR FORCE BASE, NEW MEXICO		
4. PROJECT TITLE ALTER DORMITORY	5. PROJECT NUMBER MHMV943000	
<p>Guide". Project has been considered for FY97 force structure end strength.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION KIRTLAND AIR FORCE BASE, NEW MEXICO																								
4. PROJECT TITLE ALTER DORMITORY	5. PROJECT NUMBER MHMV943000																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="355 630 1428 766"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 OCT 22</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 DEC 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 OCT 15</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="355 819 1428 892"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="355 945 1428 1113"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>310</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>158</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>468</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>468</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 FEB</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 OCT 22	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 DEC 01	(d) Date Design Complete	93 OCT 15	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	310	(b) All Other Design Costs	158	(c) Total	468	(d) Contract		(e) In-house	468
(a) Date Design Started	92 OCT 22																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 DEC 01																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 OCT 15																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	310																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	158																							
(c) Total	468																							
(d) Contract																								
(e) In-house	468																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION KIRTLAND AIR FORCE BASE, NEW MEXICO		4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE ELECTRICAL DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 4.18.96	6. CATEGORY CODE 813-231	7. PROJECT NUMBER MHMV923008	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 6,844	

9. COST ESTIMATES				
ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
UPGRADE ELECTRICAL DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM	LS			5,650
UPGRADE ELECTRIC SUBSTATIONS	EA	3	200,000	(3,600)
OVERHEAD DISTRIBUTION LINES	LF	20,000	15	(300)
TRANSFORMERS SINGLE PHASE	EA	20	5,000	(100)
TRANSFORMERS THREE PHASE	EA	150	11,000	(1,650)
SUPPORTING FACILITIES				225
SITE IMPROVEMENTS (PAD REPLACEMENT)	LS			(225)
SUBTOTAL				5,875
CONTINGENCY (10%)				588
TOTAL CONTRACT COST				6,463
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)				388
TOTAL REQUEST				6,851
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)				6,844

10. Description of Proposed Construction: Upgrade substations 23, 24 and 25; 20 single phase transformers, 150 three phase transformers. Replace associated electrical distribution lines. Site improvements include replacing concrete substation and transformer pads, replacing security barriers around substations and transformers and trenching under roadways.

11. REQUIREMENT: As required.

PROJECT: Upgrade electrical distribution system. (Current Mission)

REQUIREMENT: An adequate base electrical distribution system is required to support operation and maintenance of base facilities and functions.

CURRENT SITUATION: The existing westside base electrical distribution system has been in existence since early 1950's. Electrical power is commercially furnished. Due to the growth on the west side of Kirtland supporting the Crew Training Wing operations and Phillips Laboratory, the existing 5KV system substation transformers and feeders are now at or near full capacity. The ability to backfeed for system maintenance or emergencies no longer exist. The lower voltage 5KV system is obsolete and increasingly difficult to support (i.e. transformers, switchgear, etc). Upgrade from 5 to 15KV increases system feeder capacity approximately three times and installs a long term supportable system without having to replace or increase the size of the overhead and underground distribution system. Installing larger substation transformers increases system capacity to meet current/future needs and provides a system which is maintainable with minimum inconvenience to customers.

IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: Operation and maintenance of base functions and activities could be seriously impacted which would be detrimental to the base's ability to perform its mission.

ADDITIONAL: There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION KIRTLAND AIR FORCE BASE, NEW MEXICO		
4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE ELECTRICAL DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM	5. PROJECT NUMBER MHMV923008	
<p>Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements". A preliminary analysis of reasonable options for accomplishing this project, status quo, and upgrade was done. It indicates that the only option that will satisfy operational requirements is to upgrade the existing electrical distribution system. Because of this, a full economic analysis was not performed. Project has been considered for FY97 force structure end strength.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION KIRTLAND AIR FORCE BASE, NEW MEXICO																								
4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE ELECTRICAL DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM	5. PROJECT NUMBER MHMV923008																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="355 619 1404 756"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 JUL 23</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 SEP 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 SEP 24</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="355 808 1321 882"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="355 934 1404 1102"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>64</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>299</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>363</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>64</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>299</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 JUL 23	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 SEP 01	(d) Date Design Complete	93 SEP 24	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	64	(b) All Other Design Costs	299	(c) Total	363	(d) Contract	64	(e) In-house	299
(a) Date Design Started	92 JUL 23																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 SEP 01																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 SEP 24																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	64																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	299																							
(c) Total	363																							
(d) Contract	64																							
(e) In-house	299																							

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)							2. DATE		
AIR FORCE											
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION					4. COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX			
POPE AIR FORCE BASE, NORTH CAROLINA					AIR COMBAT COMMAND			0.80			
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			TOTAL
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	
a. As of 30 SEP 92		672	4017	449	23	46	48	9	157	43	5,464
b. End FY 1998		422	3697	365	23	46	48	9	157	43	4,810
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (1,890)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)		108,343									
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:		28,680									
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:		8,600									
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)		11,950									
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:		0									
g. Remaining Deficiency:		0									
h. Grand Total:		157,572									
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE			SCOPE		COST (\$000)		DESIGN STATUS		
CODE									START Cmpl		
721-312		ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES			192 PN		4,300		NOV 92 JAN 94		
722-351		DINING FACILITY			26,200 SF		4,300		NOV 92 DEC 93		
		TOTAL:					8,600				
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995)											
112-211		ADD TO TAXIWAY ALPHA			39,800 SY		4,050				
136-661		AIRCRAFT PARKING APRON LIGHTING			LS		1,500				
179-511		FIREMEN TRAINING FACILITY			500 SF		900				
211-159		AIRCRAFT CORROSION CONTROL FACILITY			40,000 SF		5,500				
		TOTAL:					11,950				
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
10. Mission or Major Functions: A composite wing which includes one A/OA-10 squadron and one C-130 squadron; and an Air Mobility Command airlift wing with two C-130 squadrons and the USAF Mobility Center. The composite wing will also include an F-16 squadron.											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:		0									
b. Water pollution:		0									
c. Occupational safety and health:		0									
d. Other Environmental:		0									

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
AIR FORCE						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION			4. PROJECT TITLE			
POPE AIR FORCE BASE, NORTH CAROLINA			ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT	6. CATEGORY CODE	7. PROJECT NUMBER	8. PROJECT COST(\$000)			
1.18.96C	721-312	TMKH943006	4,300			
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES (250 PN)		SF	50,500		2,601	
ALTERATION		SF	43,500	54	(2,349)	
ADDITION		SF	7,000	36	(252)	
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					1,090	
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(210)	
PAVEMENTS		LS			(225)	
DEMOLITION/ASBESTOS REMOVAL		SF	43,500	4	(175)	
UTILITIES		LS			(320)	
AREA DEVELOPMENT		LS			(160)	
SUBTOTAL					3,691	
CONTINGENCY (10%)					369	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					4,060	
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					244	
TOTAL REQUEST					4,304	
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					4,300	
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Alteration of structural, mechanical, and electrical systems including, installation of exterior balconies for entrances to each room; installation of room-bath-room modules; noise attenuation, and asbestos removal. Prewire each room for telephone and cable television. Includes safety and energy conservation features. Includes all utilities and necessary support. Air Conditioning: 100 Tons. Grade Mix: 250 E1-E4.						
11. REQUIREMENT: 1,503 PN ADEQUATE: 408 PN SUBSTANDARD: 952 PN PROJECT: Add to and alter two dormitories. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: A major Air Force objective is to provide unaccompanied enlisted personnel with housing that will be conducive to their proper rest, relaxation, safety, and personal well-being. Properly designed and furnished quarters, which provide some degree of individual privacy, are essential to successfully accomplish the increasingly complicated and critical jobs these people must perform supporting the base mission. CURRENT SITUATION: These dormitories have received no major upgrades since originally constructed over twenty years ago to standards in effect at the time. These facilities lack privacy and adequate living space per occupant. The dormitories have obsolete electrical and mechanical systems and inadequate lighting, insulation and sound attenuation. The existing fire detection systems do not meet the current standards as set forth in the NFPA Life Safety Code. IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: Substandard living conditions will continue to degrade the morale, productivity and career satisfaction of the enlisted force. Obsolete mechanical and electrical systems, inadequate laundry facilities, insufficient lounge and storage areas will continue to interfere with required rest, relaxation and comfort of dorm residents.						

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION POPE AIR FORCE BASE, NORTH CAROLINA		
4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES	5. PROJECT NUMBER TMKH943006	
<p>Efforts by dorm residents to accomplish daily routine housekeeping requirements will become more difficult as dorms continue to deteriorate resulting in further demoralization of the residents.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> This project meets the criteria/scope specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide." An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of new construction, revitalization, leasing and status quo operation. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, revitalization was found to be the most cost efficient over the life of the project.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION POPE AIR FORCE BASE, NORTH CAROLINA																								
4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES	5. PROJECT NUMBER TMKH943006																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="330 609 1404 756"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 NOV 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 DEC 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>94 JAN 01</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="330 798 1404 882"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="330 924 1404 1113"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>224</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>84</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>308</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>224</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>84</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 APR</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 NOV 01	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 DEC 01	(d) Date Design Complete	94 JAN 01	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	224	(b) All Other Design Costs	84	(c) Total	308	(d) Contract	224	(e) In-house	84
(a) Date Design Started	92 NOV 01																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 DEC 01																							
(d) Date Design Complete	94 JAN 01																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	224																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	84																							
(c) Total	308																							
(d) Contract	224																							
(e) In-house	84																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)				2. DATE		
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION POPE AIR FORCE BASE, NORTH CAROLINA				4. PROJECT TITLE DINING FACILITY				
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 1.18.96C		6. CATEGORY CODE 722-351		7. PROJECT NUMBER TMKH943007		8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 4,300		
9. COST ESTIMATES								
ITEM					U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
DINING FACILITY					SF	22,900		2,755
DINING HALL					SF	18,900	125	(2,363)
POSTAL SERVICE CENTER					SF	2,000	98	(196)
LINEN EXCHANGE					SF	2,000	98	(196)
SUPPORTING FACILITIES								1,090
UTILITIES					LS			(260)
PAVEMENTS					LS			(195)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS					LS			(185)
DEMOLITION					SF	13,200	34	(450)
SUBTOTAL								3,845
CONTINGENCY (5%)								192
TOTAL CONTRACT COST								4,037
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)								242
TOTAL REQUEST								4,279
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)								4,300
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Reinforced concrete slab, brick exterior, and standing seam metal roof. Facility includes dining area, serving line, kitchen, dishwashing area, bakery, refrigerated and non-perishable storage, latrines, offices, receiving area, postal service center, and linen exchange areas. Includes all utilities and required support. Air Conditioning: 110 Tons.								
11. REQUIREMENT: 22,900 SF ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 18,613 SF PROJECT: Construct an airman dining facility to include an area for a postal service center and linen exchange. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: Adequately sized and configured dining facility to properly feed assigned and transient unaccompanied personnel. Must provide space for food preparation, dishwashing equipment, dining, and food storage. An area is also required for linen exchange and for the Postal Service Center. By consolidating the dining facility, Postal Service Center, and linen exchange, economies of scale can be realized, resulting in reduction of utility costs and maintenance requirements that would have accompanied construction of individual facilities. Demolish 13,177 square foot existing dining facility. CURRENT SITUATION: The existing dining facility is substandard and beyond economical repair. The 1955 facility has extensive utility and structural problems. The plumbing/sewage has failed on numerous occasions and is presently being held together with temporary repairs to allow the dining facility to continue operating. The electrical system is severely deteriorated. It is difficult and expensive to maintain the system due to the lack of replacement parts and their high cost. The HVAC system is approximately 20 years old and provides a continuous source of maintenance								

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION POPE AIR FORCE BASE, NORTH CAROLINA		
4. PROJECT TITLE DINING FACILITY	5. PROJECT NUMBER TMKH943007	
<p>problems. Food preparation workers are frequently working in an environment where temperatures exceed 100 degrees Fahrenheit and there is little ventilation. The roof system has failed, and complete replacement is required. Also, the loading dock is inadequate and causes inefficient handling of supplies. Storage space is inadequate. One freezer unit sits outside on the loading dock due to insufficient indoor space. The linen exchange function and postal service center are located in facilities constructed in 1953 and 1942 respectively. These old facilities are inadequate for providing postal service and linen exchange to the enlisted force.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Food service and preparation will continue to be inefficient due to facility inadequacies. The poor accommodations the dining area offers to the enlisted force will continue to degrade morale.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> This project meets the scope specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide." An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of new construction, revitalization, leasing, and status quo operation. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, new construction was found to be the most cost efficient over the life of the project.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																		
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION POPE AIR FORCE BASE, NORTH CAROLINA																				
4. PROJECT TITLE DINING FACILITY	5. PROJECT NUMBER TMKH943007																			
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="360 625 1428 756"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 NOV 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 DEC 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 DEC 13</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <p>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</p> <p>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</p> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="360 945 1428 1113"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>264</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>88</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>352</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>264</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>88</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 APR</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 NOV 01	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 DEC 01	(d) Date Design Complete	93 DEC 13	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	264	(b) All Other Design Costs	88	(c) Total	352	(d) Contract	264	(e) In-house	88
(a) Date Design Started	92 NOV 01																			
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																			
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 DEC 01																			
(d) Date Design Complete	93 DEC 13																			
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	264																			
(b) All Other Design Costs	88																			
(c) Total	352																			
(d) Contract	264																			
(e) In-house	88																			

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)							2. DATE		
AIR FORCE											
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION SEYMOUR-JOHNSON AIR FORCE BASE, NORTH CAROLINA					4. COMMAND AIR COMBAT COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX 0.80			
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			TOTAL
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	
a. As of 30 SEP 92		564	4123	532		16					5,235
b. End FY 1998		534	3925	553		16					5,028
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (41,157)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)										176,848	
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:										18,230	
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:										5,380	
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)										6,290	
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:										11,100	
g. Remaining Deficiency:										0	
h. Grand Total:										217,848	
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE			SCOPE		COST (\$000)		DESIGN STATUS		
CODE									START		Cmpl
610-144		MUNITIONS MAINTENANCE SUPPORT FACILITY			3,250 SF		480		OCT 92		APR 93
721-312		ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES			304 PN		4,900		DEC 92		JUN 93
							TOTAL:		5,380		
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995)											
411-134		UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS			LS		360				
722-351		DINING HALL AND TROOP ISSUE WAREHOUSE			26,200 SF		4,430				
871-183		STORM DRAINAGE DISPOSAL			LS		1,500				
							TOTAL:		6,290		
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
218-712		ACFT SPRT EQUIP SHOP/STORAGE			LS		3,500				
411-135		JET FUEL STORAGE			4,000 SY		900				
730-142		ADD TO FIRE STATION			5,500 SF		1,000				
730-441		EDUCATION/LEARNING CENTER			25,700 SF		4,200				
740-443		TRANSIENT LODGING FACILITY			31 UN		1,500				
10. Mission or Major Functions: A flying wing which includes three fighter squadrons (F-15 aircraft) and two air refueling squadrons (KC-10 aircraft); an Air Force Reserve KC-10 associate air refueling group; and an Air National Guard fighter interceptor detachment (F-16 aircraft).											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:										0	
b. Water pollution:										360	
c. Occupational safety and health:										0	
d. Other Environmental:										0	

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)				2. DATE		
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION SEYMOUR JOHNSON AIR FORCE BASE, NORTH CAROLINA				4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES				
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 2.75.96C		6. CATEGORY CODE 721-312	7. PROJECT NUMBER VKAG943003		8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 4,900			
9. COST ESTIMATES								
ITEM					U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES (304 PN)					SF	59,100		3,217
ALTERATION					SF	50,500	54	(2,727)
ADDITION (BALCONIES)					SF	8,600	57	(490)
SUPPORTING FACILITIES								995
UTILITIES (INCL REPL CENTRAL CHILLER)					LS			(10)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS					LS			(120)
PAVEMENTS					SY	4,450	44	(195)
ASBESTOS REMOVAL					LS			(670)
SUBTOTAL								4,212
CONTINGENCY (10%)								421
TOTAL CONTRACT COST								4,633
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)								278
TOTAL REQUEST								4,911
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)								4,900
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Alteration of structural, mechanical, and electrical systems, including: installation of exterior entrances to each room, safety and energy conservation features, noise attenuation, and asbestos removal. Prewire each room for telephone and cable television. Includes all utilities and necessary support. Air Conditioning: 100 Tons. Grade Mix: 304 E1-E4.								
11. REQUIREMENT: 1,520 PN ADEQUATE: 608 PN SUBSTANDARD: 608 PN PROJECT: Add to and alter two dormitories. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: A major Air Force objective is to provide unaccompanied enlisted personnel with housing that will be conducive to their proper rest, relaxation, safety, and personal well-being. Properly designed and furnished quarters, which provide some degree of individual privacy are essential to the successful accomplishment of the increasingly complicated and important jobs these people must perform. CURRENT SITUATION: These dormitories have received no major upgrade work since they were built over thirty years ago to the standards in effect at that time. They lack privacy, adequate living space per occupant, and individual room temperature controls. They have inadequate lighting, minimal fire protection, poor insulation and sound attenuation, and obsolete electrical and mechanical systems. They have dark narrow hallways with low ceilings (due to design of the mechanical system) and exposed conduit in the hallways and rooms. This project exceeds 70 percent of the facility replacement cost; however, the economic analysis supports and justifies the decision to add to and alter the existing facility. IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: Substandard living conditions will continue to degrade the morale, productivity and career satisfaction of the enlisted								

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION SEYMOUR JOHNSON AIR FORCE BASE, NORTH CAROLINA		
4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES	5. PROJECT NUMBER VKAG943003	
<p>force.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of new construction, revitalization, leasing and status quo operation. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, revitalization was found to be the most cost effective over the life of the project. This project meets the criteria/scope specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide".</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION SEYMOUR JOHNSON AIR FORCE BASE, NORTH CAROLINA																								
4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES	5. PROJECT NUMBER VKAG943003																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="330 609 1404 756"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 DEC 04</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 DEC 11</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 JUN 01</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="330 798 1404 882"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="330 924 1404 1102"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>220</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>80</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>300</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>200</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>100</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 JAN</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 DEC 04	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 DEC 11	(d) Date Design Complete	93 JUN 01	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	220	(b) All Other Design Costs	80	(c) Total	300	(d) Contract	200	(e) In-house	100
(a) Date Design Started	92 DEC 04																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 DEC 11																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 JUN 01																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	220																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	80																							
(c) Total	300																							
(d) Contract	200																							
(e) In-house	100																							

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)							2. DATE		
AIR FORCE											
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION					4. COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX			
GRAND FORKS AIR FORCE BASE, NORTH DAKOTA					AIR COMBAT COMMAND			0.96			
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			TOTAL
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	
a. As of 30 SEP 92		680	4154	471							5,305
b. End FY 1998		634	3662	457							4,753
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (5,777)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)		301,361									
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:		19,750									
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:		2,600									
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)		20,600									
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:		29,900									
g. Remaining Deficiency:		0									
h. Grand Total:		374,211									
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE		SCOPE		COST (\$000)		DESIGN STATUS			
CODE								START	CMPL		
411-135	UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS				LS	2,600		MAY 92	JAN 93		
						TOTAL:	2,600				
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995)											
111-111	UPGRADE AIRFIELD PAVEMENTS			43,000	SY	10,200					
130-835	SECURITY POLICE OPERATIONS			31,500	SF	5,300					
411-000	UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS			33	EA	4,100					
		MISSILE FACILITIES									
871-183	STORM DRAINAGE FACILITIES				LS	1,000					
						TOTAL:	20,600				
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
111-111	UPGRADE RUNWAY				LS	5,000					
121-122	UPGRADE HYDRANT FUELING SYSTEM				LS	4,200					
610-128	SUPPORT OPERATIONS CENTER			80,021	SF	7,900					
690-000	PROCUREMENT FACILITY			8,500	SF	1,400					
831-155	INDUSTRIAL WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITIES				LS	5,000					
10. Mission or Major Functions: A bomb wing which includes one B-1 squadron; a missile wing consisting of three Minuteman intercontinental ballistic missile squadrons which maintain a continuous alter posture; a combat air rescue detachment with HH-1 helicopters; and an Air Mobility Command refueling squadron (KC-135 aircraft).											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:		0									
b. Water pollution:		16,050									
c. Occupational safety and health:		0									
d. Other Environmental:		0									

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)		2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION GRAND FORKS AIR FORCE BASE, NORTH DAKOTA			4. PROJECT TITLE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 1.18.56C	6. CATEGORY CODE 411-135	7. PROJECT NUMBER JFSD932502	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 2,600		

9. COST ESTIMATES				
ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	LS			2,228
REPLACE UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANKS	EA	24	68,210	(1,637)
UPGRADE UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANKS	EA	9	65,670	(591)
SUBTOTAL				2,228
CONTINGENCY (10%)				223
TOTAL CONTRACT COST				2,451
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)				147
TOTAL REQUEST				2,598
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)				2,600

10. Description of Proposed Construction: Excavate/remove 24 underground storage tanks. Dispose of tank residue and test soil at each site. Remove/dispose of contaminated soil. Replace tanks with new double-walled tanks, interstitial leak detectors, double-wall piping and spill/overflow protectors. Upgrade 9 tanks with leak detectors, double-wall piping, corrosion, spill, overflow protection and epoxy lining. Tightness test.

11. REQUIREMENT: As required.
PROJECT: Replace/upgrade underground storage tanks (USTs) at missile launch and launch control facilities. (Current Mission)
REQUIREMENT: This is a Level II environmental compliance project. All regulated USTs must be upgraded in accordance with Federal Law (40 CFR 280.21) by December 1998. The Law also requires that underground tanks have leak detection, corrosion protection, and spill/overflow prevention systems to protect human health and the environment.
CURRENT SITUATION: Underground storage tanks at Grand Forks AFB do not meet Federal regulatory requirements for corrosion protection, leak detection monitoring, and overflow/spill protection. These deficiencies must be corrected to prevent violation of Federal UST regulations. This project is the first of four phases, and will replace/upgrade 33 USTs. Unit costs for this project are higher than other locations due to the deep buried nature of the tanks.
IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: Undetected UST releases can result in contamination of soil and ground water supplies, resulting in a threat to human health and the environment along with extremely costly cleanup measures. These improvements to USTs are mandated by federal law. If not accomplished by the established deadline, the base will be in violation of the law and subject to Notices of Violation, fines and significant adverse

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION GRAND FORKS AIR FORCE BASE, NORTH DAKOTA		
4. PROJECT TITLE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	5. PROJECT NUMBER JFSD932502	
<p>accomplished by the established deadline, the base will be in violation of the law and subject to Notices of Violation, fines and significant adverse publicity.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> A preliminary analysis of reasonable options for accomplishing this project was done. It indicates there is only one option that satisfies statutory requirements. Because of this, a full economic analysis was not performed. A certificate of exclusion has been prepared. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements".</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION GRAND FORKS AIR FORCE BASE, NORTH DAKOTA																								
4. PROJECT TITLE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	5. PROJECT NUMBER JFSD932502																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="330 609 1404 756"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 MAY 27</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>100%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 JUL 27</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 JAN 20</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="330 798 1404 882"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="330 924 1404 1113"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>135</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>89</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>224</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>168</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>56</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 MAY 27	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	100%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 JUL 27	(d) Date Design Complete	93 JAN 20	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	135	(b) All Other Design Costs	89	(c) Total	224	(d) Contract	168	(e) In-house	56
(a) Date Design Started	92 MAY 27																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	100%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 JUL 27																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 JAN 20																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	135																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	89																							
(c) Total	224																							
(d) Contract	168																							
(e) In-house	56																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)						2. DATE			
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION MINOT AIR FORCE BASE, NORTH DAKOTA				4. COMMAND AIR COMBAT COMMAND		5. AREA CONST COST INDEX 1.07					
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT		STUDENTS			SUPPORTED				
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	TOTAL
a. As of 30 SEP 92		753	4285	578		22					5,638
b. End FY 1998		680	3847	568		22					5,117
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (5,385)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)										292,102	
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:										16,200	
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:										2,000	
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)										9,975	
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:										53,950	
g. Remaining Deficiency:										0	
h. Grand Total:										374,227	
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY CODE		PROJECT TITLE			SCOPE		COST (\$000)		DESIGN STATUS START		CMPL
411-135		UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS			LS		2,000		NOV 92		MAY 93
							TOTAL:		2,000		
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995)											
130-142		FIRE/CRASH RESCUE STATION			20,500 SF		4,000				
411-000		UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS MISSILE FACILITIES			39 EA		1,950				
411-135		UPGRADE POL DIKES AND BASINS			LS		1,425				
411-135		UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS			LS		1,100				
871-183		STORM DRAINAGE FACILITIES			LS		1,500				
							TOTAL:		9,975		
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
112-211		UPGRADE TAXIWAY (PH 1)			LS		12,600				
112-211		UPGRADE TAXIWAY (PH 2)			LS		10,000				
113-321		UPGRADE AIRCRAFT PARKING APRON			LS		3,800				
121-122		UPGRADE HYDRANT FUELING SYSTEM			LS		15,700				
211-175		NOST DOCK FIRE SUPPRESSION SYSTEM			LS		3,400				
10. Mission or Major Functions: A bomb wing which includes one B-52 squadron; a missile wing consisting of three Minuteman intercontinental ballistic missile squadrons which maintain a continuous alter posture; a combat air rescue detachment with HH-1 helicopters; and an Air Mobility Command air refueling squadron (KC-135 aircraft).											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:										0	
b. Water pollution:										13,825	
c. Occupational safety and health:										0	
d. Other Environmental:										0	

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION MINOT AIR FORCE BASE, NORTH DAKOTA			4. PROJECT TITLE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 1.18.56C	6. CATEGORY CODE 411-135	7. PROJECT NUMBER QJVF952500	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 1,950			
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS		LS			1,560	
REPLACE UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANKS		EA	39	40,000	(1,560)	
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					130	
PAVEMENTS		LS			(30)	
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(100)	
SUBTOTAL					1,690	
CONTINGENCY (10%)					169	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					1,859	
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					112	
TOTAL REQUEST					1,971	
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					1,950	
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Excavate/remove 39 underground storage tanks. Dispose of tank residue and test soil at each site. Remove/dispose of contaminated soil. Replace tanks with new double-walled tanks, interstitial leak detectors, double-wall piping, and spill/overflow protectors. Project includes all necessary support.						
11. REQUIREMENT: As required. <u>PROJECT:</u> Upgrade/replace underground storage tanks (USTs) at missile launch and launch control facilities. (Current Mission) <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> This is a Level II environmental compliance project. Adequate fuel storage, properly designed and located, is required to satisfy wing mission requirements. All petroleum dispensing and operating facilities must be provided with positive means for preventing release of pollutants into the surrounding environment. All regulated USTs must be upgraded in accordance with Federal Law (40 CFR 280.21) by December 1998. The law also requires underground tanks have leak detection, corrosion protection, and spill/overflow prevention systems to protect human health and the environment. <u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> Underground storage tanks at Minot AFB do not meet federal (40 CFR 280) and state requirements for corrosion protection, leak detection monitoring, and overflow/spill protection. Replacement is required to assure environmental compliance. This is the first phase of a four-phase effort. <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Failure to replace these tanks will result in an unacceptable risk of pollution. Additionally, Minot AFB will not be in compliance with federal and state environmental requirements thereby subjecting the base to enforcement action and monetary penalties. <u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of						

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION MINOT AIR FORCE BASE, NORTH DAKOTA		
4. PROJECT TITLE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	5. PROJECT NUMBER QJVF952500	
<p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements". All known alternative options were considered during the development of this project. No other option could meet the mission requirements; therefore, no economic analysis was needed or performed.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																																													
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION MINOT AIR FORCE BASE, NORTH DAKOTA																																															
4. PROJECT TITLE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	5. PROJECT NUMBER QJVF952500																																														
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <table data-bbox="272 588 1395 1165"> <tr> <td colspan="3">(1) Status:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td></td> <td>92 NOV 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td></td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td></td> <td>92 DEC 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td></td> <td>93 MAY 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(2) Basis:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td></td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td></td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td></td> <td>89</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td></td> <td>89</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> <td>79</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td></td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(4) Construction Start</td> <td></td> <td>93 DEC</td> </tr> </table> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(1) Status:			(a) Date Design Started		92 NOV 01	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%	(c) Date 35% Designed		92 DEC 01	(d) Date Design Complete		93 MAY 01	(2) Basis:			(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A	(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)			(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		89	(b) All Other Design Costs			(c) Total		89	(d) Contract		79	(e) In-house		10	(4) Construction Start		93 DEC
(1) Status:																																															
(a) Date Design Started		92 NOV 01																																													
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%																																													
(c) Date 35% Designed		92 DEC 01																																													
(d) Date Design Complete		93 MAY 01																																													
(2) Basis:																																															
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO																																													
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A																																													
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)																																															
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		89																																													
(b) All Other Design Costs																																															
(c) Total		89																																													
(d) Contract		79																																													
(e) In-house		10																																													
(4) Construction Start		93 DEC																																													

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)							2. DATE		
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION WRIGHT-PATTERSON AIR FORCE BASE, OHIO				4. COMMAND AIR FORCE MATERIEL COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX 1.00				
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			TOTAL
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	
a. As of 30 SEP 92		4438	3655	15936	342						24,371
b. End FY 1998		2925	1980	10135	342						15,382
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (8,245)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)										773,201	
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:										61,770	
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:										27,650	
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)										38,200	
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:										81,200	
g. Remaining Deficiency:										0	
h. Grand Total:										982,021	
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE			SCOPE		COST (\$000)		DESIGN STATUS		
CODE									START Cmpl		
310-932		ADD TO AVIONICS RESEARCH LABORATORY, PHASE II			60,000 SF		5,650		JUN 92 DEC 93		
311-173		ADD TO AND ALTER ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT COMPLEX, PHASE II			LS		12,850		AUG 92 DEC 93		
411-135		SEAL FUEL CONTAINMENT DIKES			LS		1,500		APR 92 JUL 93		
411-135		UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS PHASE II			95 EA		3,200		TURN KEY		
813-231		RENOVATE ELECTRIC SUBSTATIONS			LS		4,450		JAN 92 SEP 92		
							TOTAL:		27,650		
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995)											
100-142		FIRE STATION			9,600 SF		1,300				
171-851		ADD TO AND ALTER ENGINEERING AND RESEARCH LABORATORY			53,000 SF		17,800				
311-173		ACQUISITIONS MANAGEMENT COMPLEX, PHASE IIB			108,000 SF		15,000				
871-183		STORM DRAINAGE SYSTEM, PHASE I			12,650 LF		3,100				
880-221		FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEMS			205,000 SF		1,000				
							TOTAL:		38,200		
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
171-851		AFIT OPERATIONS COMPLEX			82,500 SF		9,400				
171-851		ADD TO AND ALTER AU PROF/TECH EDUCATION (AFIT)			25,000 SF		4,500				
311-173		ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT COMPLEX PHASE III			LS		11,500				
841-165		WATER TREATMENT PLANT, AREA C			7,000 KG		10,000				
880-211		FIRE PROTECTION BASE FACILITIES			250,000 SF		6,000				
10. Mission or Major Functions: HQ AFMC; AF Contract Law Center; AFMC International Logistics Ctr; AF Logistics Operations Ctr; Security Assistance Ctr; Materiel Systems Ctr; Center for Support & Technology Insertions; AFMC Safety/Inspection Ctr; Aeronautical Systems Ctr; Wright Laboratory; Aerospace Medical Research Directorate; & test wing with various types of aircraft; AF Institute of Technology; AF Intelligence											

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)							2. DATE		
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION WRIGHT-PATTERSON AIR FORCE BASE, OHIO					4. COMMAND AIR FORCE MATERIEL COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX 1.00			
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			TOTAL
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	
a. As of											
b. End FY											
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: b. Inventory Total As Of: c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory: d. Authorization Requested In This Program: e. Authorization Included In Following Program: f. Planned In Next Four Program Years: g. Remaining Deficiency: h. Grand Total:											
Command Foreign Aerospace Ctr; an AFRES fighter squadron (F-16's); and AMC airlift detach (C-12/C-21); AF Museum; & a major Air Force medical center.											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:											19,400
b. Water pollution:											12,500
c. Occupational safety and health:											3,000
d. Other Environmental:											3,850

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)		2. DATE	
AIR FORCE					
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION			4. PROJECT TITLE		
WRIGHT-PATTERSON AIR FORCE BASE, OHIO			ADD TO AVIONICS RESEARCH LABORATORY, PHASE II		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT	6. CATEGORY CODE	7. PROJECT NUMBER	8. PROJECT COST(\$000)		
7.28.06	310-932	ZHTP913302	5,650		
9. COST ESTIMATES					
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
ADD TO AVIONICS RESEARCH LABORATORY, PHASE II		SF	37,000	125	4,625
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					450
UTILITIES		LS			(250)
PAVEMENTS		LS			(50)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(25)
COMMUNICATION SUPPORT		LS			(20)
TEMPEST SHIELDING		LS			(30)
PASSIVE SOLAR		SF	36,900	2	(75)
SUBTOTAL					5,075
CONTINGENCY (5%)					254
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					5,329
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					320
TOTAL REQUEST					5,649
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					5,650
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Reinforced concrete foundation and floor slab, structural frame, walls, roof system, utilities, and necessary support. Air Conditioning: 200 Tons.					
11. REQUIREMENT: 645,705 SF ADEQUATE: 59,068 SF SUBSTANDARD: 0 PROJECT: Add to an avionics research laboratory, phase II (of II). (Current Mission) <u>REQUIREMENT</u> : An adequate facility is required for research and development of new mission integrated avionics systems which serve as the eyes, ears, and brains for modern aircraft. Sensor data from radar, reconnaissance, weapons delivery, and electronic warfare systems on board the aircraft, when merged with data from off-board systems, must provide the air crew with the best possible information relative to the location of friends, foes, and targets. Data previously treated separately for these systems must be integrated to permit aircrews to make rapid decisions in a dynamic battle environment. This integration must first be tested in the laboratory for the new technology to be successfully proven. The close location of avionics equipment and personnel is needed for successful research and development of this technology. <u>CURRENT SITUATION</u> : Many of the critical laboratory functions are housed in widely dispersed substandard facilities built in the 1940's. Being separated from the main avionics complex prevents real-time transfer of data among functions working on avionics integration. Electronics response times are now being measured in billionths of a second. With these faster electronic response times, physical separations over a few hundred feet cause timing and signal distortions in real-time research simulations. Real-time processing of enemy threat signal reception and					

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION WRIGHT-PATTERSON AIR FORCE BASE, OHIO		
4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO AVIONICS RESEARCH LABORATORY, PHASE II	5. PROJECT NUMBER ZHTP913302	
<p>jamming responses requires extremely short signal transmission delays. Transmissions between existing facilities result in delays of 25 to 100 times the acceptable maximum. Avionics development programs in the forefront of the technology cannot be fully integrated or evaluated utilizing the facilities as they presently exist, thereby limiting the avionics capability projected for the Advanced Tactical Fighter and other advanced aircraft. There are no available facilities capable of housing the required tasks. Industrial facilities are limited in capacity and are tailored to their respective products.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Without this project the processing of real time data cannot be performed, thus seriously impacting the laboratory ability to test critical avionics equipment.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide" or in Air Force Manual 86-2. An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of new construction, revitalization, leasing and status quo operation. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, new construction was found to be the most cost efficient over the life of the project.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																																													
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION WRIGHT-PATTERSON AIR FORCE BASE, OHIO																																															
4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO AVIONICS RESEARCH LABORATORY, PHASE II	5. PROJECT NUMBER ZHTP913302																																														
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td colspan="3">(1) Status:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td></td> <td>92 JUN 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td></td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td></td> <td>92 OCT 21</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td></td> <td>93 DEC 30</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(2) Basis:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td></td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td></td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td></td> <td>330</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td></td> <td>252</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td></td> <td>582</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> <td>400</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td></td> <td>182</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(4) Construction Start</td> <td></td> <td>94 MAR</td> </tr> </table> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(1) Status:			(a) Date Design Started		92 JUN 01	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%	(c) Date 35% Designed		92 OCT 21	(d) Date Design Complete		93 DEC 30	(2) Basis:			(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A	(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)			(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		330	(b) All Other Design Costs		252	(c) Total		582	(d) Contract		400	(e) In-house		182	(4) Construction Start		94 MAR
(1) Status:																																															
(a) Date Design Started		92 JUN 01																																													
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%																																													
(c) Date 35% Designed		92 OCT 21																																													
(d) Date Design Complete		93 DEC 30																																													
(2) Basis:																																															
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO																																													
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A																																													
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)																																															
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		330																																													
(b) All Other Design Costs		252																																													
(c) Total		582																																													
(d) Contract		400																																													
(e) In-house		182																																													
(4) Construction Start		94 MAR																																													

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION WRIGHT-PATTERSON AIR FORCE BASE, OHIO			4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO AND ALTER ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT COMPLEX, PHASE II			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 7.28.06	6. CATEGORY CODE 311-173	7. PROJECT NUMBER ZHTV933302	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 12,850			
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
ADD TO AND ALTER ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT COMPLEX, PHASE II		SF	100,000		7,578	
ADDITION (UTILITIES VAULT)		SF	38,000	95	(3,610)	
ALTERATION (RESEARCH LAB)		SF	62,000	64	(3,968)	
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					3,340	
UTILITIES		LS			(1,400)	
PAVEMENTS		SY	18,000	45	(810)	
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(250)	
COMMUNICATIONS SUPPORT		LS			(200)	
PREWIRED WORK STATIONS		EA	200	3,400	(680)	
SUBTOTAL					10,918	
CONTINGENCY (10%)					1,092	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					12,010	
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					721	
TOTAL REQUEST					12,731	
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					12,850	
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Concrete foundation, slab, columns and wall panels, built-up roof, freight elevator, and utilities connections to base systems. Alter existing building to accommodate simulators, rehabilitate building systems and provide corridor linkage to other buildings; provide prewired work stations, 500 vehicle parking area and necessary support. Air Conditioning: 650 Tons.						
11. REQUIREMENT: 1,125,100 LS ADEQUATE: 220,100 LS SUBSTANDARD: 1,455,500 LS <u>PROJECT</u> : Add to and alter acquisition management complex, phase II (of II), which includes construction of a utilities vault and alteration of an engineering research laboratory. (Current Mission) <u>REQUIREMENT</u> : A consolidated utilities distribution vault to serve the acquisition management center is required to achieve efficient reliable facilities support through centralized utilities and communications services to the complex, thereby providing economy of scale, necessary redundancy, reliability, and controlled growth capacity. The utilities vault will support programmed expansion of the complex. Alteration of adjacent engineering research lab, which will be incorporated into the complex, is needed to accommodate simulator relocations, extend security access control, and provide more effective space utilization of existing assets. This project is the cornerstone of the 10-year plan for revitalization of the Aerospace Systems Center in support of aerospace development into the next century. <u>CURRENT SITUATION</u> : Capacity and reliability of 1940s vintage utilities, such as the gas and electrical distribution systems, and communications connections are totally inadequate to meet the needs of the AMC.						

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION WRIGHT-PATTERSON AIR FORCE BASE, OHIO		
4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO AND ALTER ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT COMPLEX, PHASE II	5. PROJECT NUMBER ZHTV933302	
<p>Utilities terminals are in the wrong locations for efficient and reliable servicing of the proposed complex. Ground communications are outdated, decentralized, inefficient, and present potential security compromises, reflecting years of piecemeal expansion and constantly changing usage. Existing utilities and communications capabilities have been exhausted in support of Phase I construction. The existing engineering research lab is isolated and its high bay area, originally planned as an optical lab, is currently underutilized while the remainder of the space is highly segmented and inefficient as lab space.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Without the utilities distribution vault, the acquisition management complex cannot be effectively utilized, depriving the Air Force of the economies and other benefits attributed to this effort. The engineering research laboratory cannot be integrated into the complex without the security and infrastructure support of this project, thereby depriving us of the capability to perform classified simulations.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> This project meets the criteria/scope specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of new construction, revitalization, leasing and status quo operation. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, new construction was found to be the most cost efficient over the life of the project.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION WRIGHT-PATTERSON AIR FORCE BASE, OHIO																								
4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO AND ALTER ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT COMPLEX, PHASE II	5. PROJECT NUMBER ZHTV933302																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="346 619 1412 756"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 AUG 16</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 DEC 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 DEC 31</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="346 819 1329 892"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="346 945 1412 1113"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>792</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>358</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>1150</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>980</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>170</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 APR</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 AUG 16	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 DEC 01	(d) Date Design Complete	93 DEC 31	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	792	(b) All Other Design Costs	358	(c) Total	1150	(d) Contract	980	(e) In-house	170
(a) Date Design Started	92 AUG 16																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 DEC 01																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 DEC 31																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	792																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	358																							
(c) Total	1150																							
(d) Contract	980																							
(e) In-house	170																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)				2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION WRIGHT-PATTERSON AIR FORCE BASE, OHIO			4. PROJECT TITLE SEAL FUEL CONTAINMENT DIKES				
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 7.80.56		6. CATEGORY CODE 411-135	7. PROJECT NUMBER ZHTV923206		8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 1,500		
9. COST ESTIMATES							
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)		
SEAL FUEL CONTAINMENT DIKES		LS			1,174		
SEAL FUEL CONTAINMENT DIKES		SY	20,300	38	(771)		
REPLACE PIPELINE		LF	5,300	76	(403)		
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					110		
UTILITIES		LS			(40)		
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(20)		
RESHAPE EARTH BERMS		LS			(50)		
SUBTOTAL					1,284		
CONTINGENCY (10%)					128		
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					1,412		
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					85		
TOTAL REQUEST					1,497		
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					1,500		
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Construct a concrete liner on bottom of 13 spill basins, extending the liner into the earth dikes. Replace fuel pipeline, valves and accessories beneath area to be paved.							
11. REQUIREMENT: As required. PROJECT: Seal thirteen fuel containment dikes. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: This is a Level I environmental compliance requirement. Secondary containment around fuel storage areas is needed to contain all liquid petroleum which may spill from above-ground fuel storage tanks in event of tank rupture. The Federal Oil Pollution Prevention Regulation (40CFR, Section 112-7(e)(2)) requires impervious secondary containment for above ground tanks. This project is required in order to seal the dikes and replace deteriorated sections of pipeline beneath the containment area to prevent fuel from penetrating the ground or the dikes and polluting the soil and aquifer. CURRENT SITUATION: Existing earthen dikes are not impervious and are coated with asphalt to reduce erosion. The base of the diked area is sand and gravel which permit leaching to the aquifer. The dikes cannot contain spilled fuel and do not meet criteria stated in the Federal Oil Pollution Prevention Regulation (Code of Federal Regulations, Title 40, Section 112) and Ohio Revised Code (ORC) 6111.02. Additionally, there is evidence that fuel lines in the vicinity of the fuel farm have been leaking. IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: In event of a fuel spill, surrounding soil and the underlying aquifer will be quickly contaminated causing significant damage to the environment. ADDITIONAL: There is no criteria/scope for this project in either Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide" or Air Force Manual 86-2.							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																																													
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION WRIGHT-PATTERSON AIR FORCE BASE, OHIO																																															
4. PROJECT TITLE SEAL FUEL CONTAINMENT DIKES	5. PROJECT NUMBER ZHTV923206																																														
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td colspan="3">(1) Status:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td></td> <td>92 APR 05</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td></td> <td>45%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td></td> <td>92 JUL 19</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td></td> <td>93 JUL 12</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(2) Basis:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td></td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td></td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td></td> <td>90</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td></td> <td>40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td></td> <td>130</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td></td> <td>130</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(4) Construction Start</td> <td></td> <td>93 DEC</td> </tr> </table> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(1) Status:			(a) Date Design Started		92 APR 05	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		45%	(c) Date 35% Designed		92 JUL 19	(d) Date Design Complete		93 JUL 12	(2) Basis:			(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A	(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)			(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		90	(b) All Other Design Costs		40	(c) Total		130	(d) Contract			(e) In-house		130	(4) Construction Start		93 DEC
(1) Status:																																															
(a) Date Design Started		92 APR 05																																													
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		45%																																													
(c) Date 35% Designed		92 JUL 19																																													
(d) Date Design Complete		93 JUL 12																																													
(2) Basis:																																															
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO																																													
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A																																													
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)																																															
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		90																																													
(b) All Other Design Costs		40																																													
(c) Total		130																																													
(d) Contract																																															
(e) In-house		130																																													
(4) Construction Start		93 DEC																																													

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION WRIGHT-PATTERSON AIR FORCE BASE, OHIO			4. PROJECT TITLE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS PHASE II			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 7.80.56		6. CATEGORY CODE 411-135	7. PROJECT NUMBER ZHTV953204	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 3,200		
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS PHASE II		EA	99	21,580	2,136	
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					610	
UTILITIES		LS			(120)	
MAINTENANCE AND CLEANING		LS			(195)	
SITE ASSESSMENTS AND REMEDIATION		LS			(295)	
SUBTOTAL					2,746	
CONTINGENCY (10%)					275	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					3,021	
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					181	
TOTAL REQUEST					3,202	
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					3,200	
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Install cathodic protection, release detection, and overflow prevention systems in 99 underground storage tanks. Also includes cleaning, sandblasting, coating, pressure testing, and installation of manways as required.						
11. REQUIREMENT: As required. PROJECT: Upgrade 99 underground storage tanks, phase 2 of 2. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: This is a Level II environmental compliance project. Environmentally safe storage tanks are required to ensure continued operating storage of petroleum products and other environmentally controlled substances which are consumed in support/operation of emergency generators, gas stations, base shops, experimental laboratories, etc. Underground tanks must comply with federal and state environmental regulations. Under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Subtitle (40 CFR, parts 280 & 281) underground storage tanks must be provided with leak detection, spill/overflow prevention and for steel tanks, cathodic protection. The mandatory compliance date for this requirement is December 1998. The Ohio Administration Code (OAC) 1301: rules 7-7-28, 7-9-6, 7 requires compliance by December 1998; rules 7-9-9, 10 require compliance by 22 December 1995. Additionally, ORC 6111.04, Water Pollution Control, prohibits pollution of state waters. CURRENT SITUATION: The existing 99 underground tanks do not comply with the following EPA standards which become effective in December 1995: OAC 1301: 7-9-9 designated Wright-Patterson as a sensitive area because it is located on sole source aquifer; OAC 1301: 7-9-10, Alternative Release Containment & Release Detection Methods for UST Systems Located in Sensitive Areas. Other rules requiring compliance are: 7-7-28 Ohio Fire						

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION WRIGHT-PATTERSON AIR FORCE BASE, OHIO		
4. PROJECT TITLE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS PHASE II	5. PROJECT NUMBER ZHTV953204	
<p>Code Article 28, Flammable & Combustible Liquids; 7-9-6 Design, Construction, Installation & Upgrading for UST Systems; and 7-9-7 Leak Detection Requirements and Methods for UST Systems. Existing tanks do not have cathodic protection. This is the final phase of a two phased effort to upgrade regulated underground storage tanks at this base.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Wright-Patterson AFB will continue to pose a threat of contaminating the environment, especially groundwater, with hazardous petroleum products. Noncompliance with state or federal environmental laws and directives could result in issuance of Notices of Violation. Alternatively, abandoning these tanks would seriously impact base missions.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There is no criteria/scope for this project in either Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide" or in AFM 86-2. The number and size of tanks are determined based upon individual requirements at each facility. All reasonable alternatives (status quo, revitalization and replacement) were considered during the development of this project. No other option could meet the mission requirements; therefore, a formal economic analysis was not needed or performed. A certificate of exemption has been prepared.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE				
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION WRIGHT-PATTERSON AIR FORCE BASE, OHIO						
4. PROJECT TITLE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS PHASE II	5. PROJECT NUMBER ZHTV953204					
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Project to be accomplished by one step turn key procedures</p> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="330 672 1404 766"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>YES</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>WRIGHT P</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Design Allowance 165</p> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	YES	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	WRIGHT P
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	YES					
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	WRIGHT P					

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE			
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION WRIGHT-PATTERSON AIR FORCE BASE, OHIO				4. PROJECT TITLE RENOVATE ELECTRIC SUBSTATIONS				
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 7.28.96		6. CATEGORY CODE 813-231	7. PROJECT NUMBER ZHTV933203		8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 4,450			
9. COST ESTIMATES								
ITEM					U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
RENOVATE ELECTRIC SUBSTATIONS					LS			3,350
SUPPORTING FACILITIES								440
UTILITIES					LS			(250)
PAVEMENTS					LS			(120)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS					LS			(70)
SUBTOTAL								3,790
CONTINGENCY (10%)								379
TOTAL CONTRACT COST								4,169
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)								250
TOTAL REQUEST								4,419
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)								4,450
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Replace 69 KV circuit breakers and relays in six substations. Includes replacement of lighting arrestors and provision of manholes, and other required support.								
11. REQUIREMENT: As required. PROJECT: Renovate six electrical substations. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: The repair of these electrical substations is required to provide reliable and sufficient power to critical facilities located in this area of the base. Expansion throughout the years of the major tenants in this area of the base (Aeronautical Systems Center, Air Force Institute of Technology and the Air Force Museum) has heightened the need to replace major components of this 40 year old electrical distribution system. The primary functions of these facilities which are used for research and development, testing, and computer technology make electrical reliability mission essential. CURRENT SITUATION: The electrical distribution system serving these facilities is 40 years old and not reliable. Faulty relaying and failed (exploding) breakers have caused two complete power outages in this part of the base in one year. This has produced an estimated loss of nearly \$4 million in man-hours along with productivity losses. A single failure in the electrical system could blackout a large portion of this base for an extended period of time. A power failure will cause the shutdown of critical equipment supporting research and development efforts and sensitive computer equipment. IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: In the event of a power failure at any of these substations, the continuous mission of one or more organizations will be interrupted, causing the loss of millions of dollars in lost manhours and productivity.								

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION WRIGHT-PATTERSON AIR FORCE BASE, OHIO		
4. PROJECT TITLE RENOVATE ELECTRIC SUBSTATIONS	5. PROJECT NUMBER ZHTV933203	
<p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide" or in Air Force Manual 86-2. The scope is based on the engineering design of this base infrastructure system. An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of renovation or replacement of the system, and status quo operation. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, renovation was found to be the most cost efficient over the life of the project.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION WRIGHT-PATTERSON AIR FORCE BASE, OHIO																								
4. PROJECT TITLE RENOVATE ELECTRIC SUBSTATIONS	5. PROJECT NUMBER ZHTV933203																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="346 619 1404 756"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 JAN 10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>100%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 FEB 05</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>92 SEP 21</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="346 808 1321 882"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="346 934 1404 1102"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>150</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>200</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>200</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 JAN 10	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	100%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 FEB 05	(d) Date Design Complete	92 SEP 21	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	150	(b) All Other Design Costs	50	(c) Total	200	(d) Contract		(e) In-house	200
(a) Date Design Started	92 JAN 10																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	100%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 FEB 05																							
(d) Date Design Complete	92 SEP 21																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	150																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	50																							
(c) Total	200																							
(d) Contract																								
(e) In-house	200																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)						2. DATE			
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ALTUS AIR FORCE BASE, OKLAHOMA				4. COMMAND AIR MOBILITY COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX 0.86				
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			TOTAL
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	
a. As of 30 SEP 92		394	2778	483	150	219	3				4,027
b. End FY 1998		372	2495	475	150	219	3				3,714
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (4,698)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)										171,693	
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:										94,740	
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:										6,930	
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)										3,750	
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:										51,970	
g. Remaining Deficiency:										0	
h. Grand Total:										329,083	
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE			SCOPE	COST (\$000)	DESIGN STATUS				
CODE						START	Cmpl				
130-142	C-17 FIRE STATION (DBOF)			2,600 SF	780	AUG 92	MAY 93				
171-212	C-17 ADD TO FLIGHT SIMULATION TRAINING FACILITY, PHASE II			12,400 SF	2,850	JUL 92	JUN 93				
218-712	C-17 ADD TO AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE FACILITY			LS	3,300	AUG 92	MAY 93				
					TOTAL:	6,930					
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995)											
721-312	ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORY			100 PN	3,750						
					TOTAL:	3,750					
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
121-122	ADD TO AND ALTER HYDRANT FUELING SYSTEM			LS	8,400						
121-122	ADD TO AND ALTER HYDRANT FUELING SYSTEM			LS	13,200						
179-511	FIREMEN TRAINING FACILITY			LS	950						
211-111	MAINTENANCE HANGAR			98,900 SF	15,000						
411-135	REPAIR JET FUEL STORAGE			23 TK	920						
10. Mission or Major Functions: An air mobility wing with one C-5 squadron and one C-141 squadron that are responsible for training all C-5 and C-141 aircrews, and two air refueling squadrons (KC-135 aircraft). Also, designated to be the primary base for training all C-17 aircrews.											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:										950	
b. Water pollution:										0	
c. Occupational safety and health:										0	
d. Other Environmental:										2,370	

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)		2. DATE	
AIR FORCE					
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION			4. PROJECT TITLE		
ALTUS AIR FORCE BASE, OKLAHOMA			C-17 ADD TO FLIGHT SIMULATION TRAINING FACILITY, PHII (DBOF)		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT	6. CATEGORY CODE	7. PROJECT NUMBER	8. PROJECT COST(\$000)		
4.11.30M	171-212	AGGN943004	2,850		
9. COST ESTIMATES					
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
C-17 ADD TO FLIGHT SIMULATION TRAINING FACILITY, PHII (DBOF)		SF	12,400	165	2,046
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					375
UTILITIES		LS			(210)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(55)
PAVEMENTS		SY	2,850	39	(110)
SUBTOTAL					2,421
CONTINGENCY (10%)					242
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					2,663
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					160
TOTAL REQUEST					2,823
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					2,850
EQUIPMENT FROM OTHER APPROPRIATIONS (NON-ADD)					(63,600)
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Concrete foundations, floor slab, masonry walls, high bay areas, and sloped roof. All special foundations and utilities systems to support the simulator equipment. Also included are supporting pavements for roads, parking and sidewalks. Air Conditioning: 50 Tons.					
11. REQUIREMENT: 127,667 SF ADEQUATE: 115,292 SF SUBSTANDARD: 0 PROJECT: Add to C-17 flight simulation training facility, phase 2 of 2. (New Mission) REQUIREMENT: Four bays are required to house new six-way flight simulators for the C-17 aircrew training program. These simulators will provide initial training, qualification, proficiency, and effective mission procedures training. These simulators are essential to provide hazardous emergency training procedures that otherwise could not be provided. For example, it would not be possible to actually fly three engine take offs safely. Facility construction is required in FY94 in order that the facility be construction complete in August 1995 to meet the simulator equipment delivery date of September 1995. CURRENT SITUATION: This project is the second phase of a two phase program to construct flight simulator facilities to support the beddown of the C-17 aircraft at this base. The first phase was approved in the FY91 MILCON program to support initial delivery of the new aircraft and construction will be completed in 1993. This request will provide the final three bays needed to support C-17 aircrew training requirements. Other existing simulator facilities are and will continue to be in use for C-141, C-5, and KC-135 aircrew training. There are no other facilities on base which can be upgraded to meet this requirement. IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: The beddown of the C-17 aircraft could not be					

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ALTUS AIR FORCE BASE, OKLAHOMA		
4. PROJECT TITLE C-17 ADD TO FLIGHT SIMULATION TRAINING FACILITY, PHII (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER AGGN943004	
<p>accomplished without providing an adequate flight simulator facility for training aircrews. Delay in providing requested construction will be grounds for the simulator equipment vendor to renegotiate the contract to provide the three simulators. It is estimated that a new contract will result in a \$30 to \$40 million increase to purchase simulator equipment.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements". A preliminary analysis of reasonable options for accomplishing this project (status quo, renovation, addition and new construction) was done. It indicates there is only one option (addition) that will meet operational requirements. Because of this, a full economic analysis was not performed. A certificate of exception has been prepared. Project has been considered for FY97 force structure end strength.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																														
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ALTUS AIR FORCE BASE, OKLAHOMA																																
4. PROJECT TITLE C-17 ADD TO FLIGHT SIMULATION TRAINING FACILITY, PHII (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER AGGN943004																															
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 JUL 16</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 AUG 16</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 JUN 11</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>135</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>116</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>251</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>180</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>71</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 FEB</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations:</p> <table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th>EQUIPMENT NOMENCLATURE</th> <th>PROCURING APPROPRIATION</th> <th>FISCAL YEAR APPROPRIATED OR REQUESTED</th> <th>COST (\$000)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>C-17 FLIGHT SIMULATOR</td> <td>3080</td> <td>FY92</td> <td>63600</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			(a) Date Design Started	92 JUL 16	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 AUG 16	(d) Date Design Complete	93 JUN 11	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	135	(b) All Other Design Costs	116	(c) Total	251	(d) Contract	180	(e) In-house	71	EQUIPMENT NOMENCLATURE	PROCURING APPROPRIATION	FISCAL YEAR APPROPRIATED OR REQUESTED	COST (\$000)	C-17 FLIGHT SIMULATOR	3080	FY92	63600
(a) Date Design Started	92 JUL 16																															
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																															
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 AUG 16																															
(d) Date Design Complete	93 JUN 11																															
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																															
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																															
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	135																															
(b) All Other Design Costs	116																															
(c) Total	251																															
(d) Contract	180																															
(e) In-house	71																															
EQUIPMENT NOMENCLATURE	PROCURING APPROPRIATION	FISCAL YEAR APPROPRIATED OR REQUESTED	COST (\$000)																													
C-17 FLIGHT SIMULATOR	3080	FY92	63600																													

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)				2. DATE		
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ALTUS AIR FORCE BASE, OKLAHOMA			4. PROJECT TITLE C-17 ADD TO AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE FACILITY (DBOF)					
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 4.11.30M		6. CATEGORY CODE 218-712	7. PROJECT NUMBER AGGN923002		8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 3,300			
9. COST ESTIMATES								
ITEM					U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
C-17 ADD TO AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE FACILITY (DBOF)					SF	27,000		2,518
AEROSPACE GROUND EQUIPMENT ADDITION					SF	8,200	100	(820)
AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE UNIT ADDITION					SF	12,000	86	(1,032)
EQUIPMENT SHOP/STORAGE ADDITION					SF	6,800	98	(666)
SUPPORTING FACILITIES								295
UTILITIES					LS			(100)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS					LS			(25)
PAVEMENTS					LS			(60)
FUEL DISPENSING/STORAGE					LS			(50)
SUBTOTAL								2,813
CONTINGENCY (10%)								281
TOTAL CONTRACT COST								3,094
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)								186
TOTAL REQUEST								3,280
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)								3,300
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Addition to Aircraft Ground Equipment (AGE) Shop will have concrete footings, foundation and floor slab with high bay steel frame, insulated walls and roof and overhead two ton hoist. Addition to the Aircraft Maintenance Unit (AMU) will be a steel framed mezzanine, latrines, utilities and necessary support.								
11. REQUIREMENT: As required. PROJECT: Add to C-17 aircraft maintenance facility. (New Mission) REQUIREMENT: Properly sized and configured facility for maintenance, repair and storage of powered aircraft support equipment including administrative support, tools, maintenance equipment, bench stock, technical data library and battery storage to support the beddown of the C-17 aircraft. A properly sized Aircraft Maintenance Unit (AMU) is required for the displaced C-5 AMU in Building 279 (AGE Shop) and the new C-17 AMU to provide adequate administrative support, tool kit storage area, change rooms, and technical data library to support each weapon system. CURRENT SITUATION: The existing aircraft support shop is not properly configured, sized to support the new mission. The existing facility does not allow for easy access to maintenance bays for daily maintenance or storage to prevent damage from inclement weather. Equipment awaiting parts must be secured and placed outside to allow other equipment to be maintained. There are no other facilities available to house the new C-17 AMU or the C-5 AMU relocated with this project without construction of additional space. IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: It will not be possible to provide adequate aircraft support equipment maintenance and AMU space for the new C-17 aircraft and AMU space to support the C-5 aircraft. Lack of functional								

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ALTUS AIR FORCE BASE, OKLAHOMA		
4. PROJECT TITLE C-17 ADD TO AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE FACILITY (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER AGGN923002	
<p>AGE and AMU facilities will delay aircraft generation, and in some cases, loss of critical training missions.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements". An economic analysis has been prepared which supports this project. Project has been considered for FY97 force structure end strength.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ALTUS AIR FORCE BASE, OKLAHOMA																								
4. PROJECT TITLE C-17 ADD TO AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE FACILITY (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER AGGN923002																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="346 619 1428 756"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 AUG 16</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 SEP 17</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 MAY 21</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="346 819 1428 892"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="346 945 1428 1113"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>200</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>187</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>387</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>239</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>148</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 AUG 16	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 SEP 17	(d) Date Design Complete	93 MAY 21	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	200	(b) All Other Design Costs	187	(c) Total	387	(d) Contract	239	(e) In-house	148
(a) Date Design Started	92 AUG 16																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 SEP 17																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 MAY 21																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	200																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	187																							
(c) Total	387																							
(d) Contract	239																							
(e) In-house	148																							

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)						2. DATE			
AIR FORCE											
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION						4. COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX		
TINKER AIR FORCE BASE, OKLAHOMA						AIR FORCE MATERIEL COMMAND			0.87		
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	TOTAL
a. As of 30 SEP 92		1433	5657	13357							20,447
b. End FY 1998		1413	5576	11476							18,465
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (4,885)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92) 562,263											
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory: 104,330											
d. Authorization Requested In This Program: 21,549											
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995) 25,000											
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years: 87,600											
g. Remaining Deficiency: 0											
h. Grand Total: 800,742											
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE				SCOPE	COST (\$000)	DESIGN STATUS			
CODE								START	CMPL		
121-122		ALTER HYDRANT FUELING SYSTEM				5,300 LF	4,129	SEP 92	SEP 93		
131-132		MILSTAR COMMUNICATIONS GROUND TERMINAL				LS	800	NOV 92	SEP 93		
411-135		SEAL FUEL CONTAINMENT DIKES				14,800 SY	620	JUN 92	SEP 93		
411-135		UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS				78 EA	4,700	JUL 92	SEP 93		
610-243		ENGINEERING AND CONTRACT SUPPORT FACILITY				47,700 SF	5,900	AUG 92	SEP 93		
831-155		INDUSTRIAL WASTEWATER REGIONAL CONNECTION (DBOF)				12,000 LF	5,400	AUG 92	DEC 93		
							TOTAL:	21,549			
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995)											
141-753		SQUADRON OPERATIONS/MOBILITY CENTER				40,600 SF	5,700				
217-742		POWER PRODUCTION-REFRIGERATION MAINTENANCE FACILITY				36,500 SF	4,000				
610-287		ENGINEERING AND INSTALLATIONS FACILITY				66,275 SF	8,800				
721-312		ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES				280 PN	4,500				
871-183		STORM DRAINAGE SYSTEM				LS	2,000				
							TOTAL:	25,000			
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
121-122		ADD TO AND ALTER JET FUEL TRANSFER SYSTEM				LS	2,500				
141-764		SOFTWARE SUPPORT FACILITY				52,000 SF	8,800				
217-742		MOBILITY OPERATIONS FACILITY				12,000 SF	1,200				
217-742		COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS SQUADRON OPERATIONS FACILITY				44,300 SF	4,350				
826-123		ALTER AIR CONDITIONING PLANT				LS	2,650				
10. Mission or Major Functions: Oklahoma City Air Logistics Center which is responsible for logistics management, support, and depot-level maintenance of E-3, B-1, B-2, B-52, and KC-135 aircraft, and aircraft engines; Air Combat Command Air control wing (E-3 and EC-135/C-135 aircraft) and combat communications group; and an Air Force Reserve											

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)							2. DATE		
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION TINKER AIR FORCE BASE, OKLAHOMA					4. COMMAND AIR FORCE MATERIEL COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX 0.87		
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH	PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			TOTAL
	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	
a. As of										
b. End FY										
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)										
a. Total Acreage: b. Inventory Total As Of: c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory: d. Authorization Requested In This Program: e. Authorization Included In Following Program: f. Planned In Next Four Program Years: g. Remaining Deficiency: h. Grand Total: fighter group (F-16 aircraft). 11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:										
a. Air pollution:								30,100		
b. Water pollution:								5,100		
c. Occupational safety and health:								6,000		
d. Other Environmental:								4,000		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION TINKER AIR FORCE BASE, OKLAHOMA			4. PROJECT TITLE ALTER HYDRANT FUELING SYSTEM			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 7.28.96	6. CATEGORY CODE 121-122	7. PROJECT NUMBER WWYK943028	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 4,129			
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
ALTER HYDRANT FUELING SYSTEM		LS			2,697	
REPLACE FUEL LINES		LF	10,600	240	(2,544)	
REPLACE HYDRANT PUMPS		EA	4	38,250	(153)	
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					825	
UTILITIES		LS			(95)	
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(50)	
LEAK DETECTION SYSTEM		LS			(195)	
REMOVE CONTAMINATED SOIL		LS			(485)	
SUBTOTAL					3,522	
CONTINGENCY (10%)					352	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					3,874	
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					232	
TOTAL REQUEST					4,106	
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					4,129	
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Replace 20 inch aluminum fuel lines with 12 inch lines, including removal and replacement of PCC apron pavement and removal of contaminated soil; replace 1200 gpm pumps with 600 gpm pumps; provide leak detection system, utilities and other support.						
11. REQUIREMENT: As required. PROJECT: Replace hydrant fueling lines and pumps. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: A reliable and environmentally safe and compliant hydrant fueling system is required to expedite refueling of E-3A AWACS aircraft and transient aircraft supporting the depot aerial port. Replacement of the existing system is needed to assure continued operational capability of these aircraft and to reduce fuel spills and to eliminate the present environmental problem of soil and ground water contamination. CURRENT SITUATION: The 4800 gallon per minute system was installed in two phases which were completed in 1978 and 1986. The 20 inch aluminum fuel lines are subject to breaks at elbow joints connecting long straight pipe sections caused by thermal expansion. This results in mission delays for the serviced aircraft and potential contamination of ground water. Breaks are located visually as fuel bubbles up between joints in the apron concrete. Since 1982, there have been at least six releases from the hydrant system due to system failure, resulting in release of thousands of gallons of fuel. Each release required removal of about 500 cubic yards of contaminated soil. The design of the present system is conducive to migration of contaminants over great distances. The aluminum fuel lines must be replaced with stainless steel to eliminate an environmental hazard and a serious operational/safety threat. The project is needed to comply with future environmental requirements and to provide for cleanup of contaminated soil. Replacement of the hydrant system is required to meet						

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION TINKER AIR FORCE BASE, OKLAHOMA		
4. PROJECT TITLE ALTER HYDRANT FUELING SYSTEM	5. PROJECT NUMBER WWYK943028	
<p>compliance standards of operation, to eliminate present extent of contamination and to avoid exacerbation of threats to environment, safety, and mission.</p> <p>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: Failure to implement this project will result in continued mission delays and soil/water contamination and could subject the base to civil or criminal actions associated with environmental damage.</p> <p>ADDITIONAL: There is no criteria/scope for this project in either Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide" or Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements". All known alternative options were considered during the development of this project. No other option could meet the mission and regulatory requirements; therefore, no economic analysis was needed or performed. A certificate of exemption has been prepared.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION TINKER AIR FORCE BASE, OKLAHOMA																								
4. PROJECT TITLE ALTER HYDRANT FUELING SYSTEM	5. PROJECT NUMBER WWYK943028																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="327 625 1381 751"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 SEP 12</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 NOV 11</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 SEP 07</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="327 821 1381 884"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="327 947 1381 1104"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>255</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>128</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>383</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>383</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 SEP 12	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 NOV 11	(d) Date Design Complete	93 SEP 07	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	255	(b) All Other Design Costs	128	(c) Total	383	(d) Contract		(e) In-house	383
(a) Date Design Started	92 SEP 12																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 NOV 11																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 SEP 07																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	255																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	128																							
(c) Total	383																							
(d) Contract																								
(e) In-house	383																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE			
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION TINKER AIR FORCE BASE, OKLAHOMA				4. PROJECT TITLE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS				
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 7.80.56		6. CATEGORY CODE 411-135	7. PROJECT NUMBER WWYK933057		8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 4,700			
9. COST ESTIMATES								
ITEM					U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS					LS			2,615
REPLACE UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANKS					EA	54	25,130	(1,357)
ALTER UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANKS					EA	24	12,670	(304)
INSTALL CENTRAL MONITORING SYSTEM					LS			(954)
SUPPORTING FACILITIES								1,410
SITE ASSESSMENT AND REMEDIATION					LS			(50)
UTILITIES					LS			(250)
PAVEMENTS					LS			(100)
TANK REMOVAL					EA	54	11,667	(630)
SUBTOTAL								4,025
CONTINGENCY (10%)								403
TOTAL CONTRACT COST								4,428
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)								266
TOTAL REQUEST								4,694
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)								4,700
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Remove and replace 54 underground storage tanks; upgrade 24 existing tanks to include installation of leak detection, spill/overflow prevention and corrosion protection, removal of oil/water separators; install a basewide tank monitoring system.								
11. REQUIREMENT: As required. PROJECT: Replace or upgrade 78 underground storage tanks. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: This is a Level II environmental compliance project. Environmentally safe storage tanks are required to ensure continued operating storage of petroleum products and other environmentally controlled substances which are used in support/operation of depot and base shops, electric generators, gas stations, laboratories, etc. Underground tanks must comply with federal and state environmental and safety regulations. In order to comply with recent Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) regulations under Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Subtitle I (40CFR, part 280) and comparable state regulations, all underground storage tanks must be upgraded or replaced by December 1998. CURRENT SITUATION: Most of the existing underground storage tanks were installed in the 1940s and are inadequate to meet stricter requirements of current regulations including leak detection, corrosion protection and spill/overflow protection. This underground storage capacity is for mission essential fuel storage. Leak tests are conducted annually and the base maintains an active manual inventory control. A central monitoring system will enable the base to perform leak detection on all their active regulated tanks from a single location and respond immediately to leaks								

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION TINKER AIR FORCE BASE, OKLAHOMA		
4. PROJECT TITLE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	5. PROJECT NUMBER WWYK933057	
<p>and fires. This expandable system will initially monitor all 78 tanks included in this project.</p> <p>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: The base will be out of compliance with EPA regulations and with the passage of time, the potential for groundwater contamination will increase. Non-compliance could result in fines of up to \$25,000 per day. Removal of tanks without replacement would seriously impact accomplishment of the base missions.</p> <p>ADDITIONAL: There is no criteria/scope for this project in either Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide" or AFM 86-2. All known alternative options were considered during the development of this project. No other option could meet the mission requirements; therefore, no economic analysis was needed or performed. A certificate of exemption has been prepared.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION TINKER AIR FORCE BASE, OKLAHOMA																								
4. PROJECT TITLE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	5. PROJECT NUMBER WWYK933057																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 JUL 13</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 SEP 28</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 SEP 13</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>288</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>225</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>513</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>363</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>150</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 JUL 13	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 SEP 28	(d) Date Design Complete	93 SEP 13	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	288	(b) All Other Design Costs	225	(c) Total	513	(d) Contract	363	(e) In-house	150
(a) Date Design Started	92 JUL 13																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 SEP 28																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 SEP 13																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	288																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	225																							
(c) Total	513																							
(d) Contract	363																							
(e) In-house	150																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)				2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION TINKER AIR FORCE BASE, OKLAHOMA			4. PROJECT TITLE ENGINEERING AND CONTRACT SUPPORT FACILITY				
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 9.12.12S		6. CATEGORY CODE 610-243	7. PROJECT NUMBER WWYK923033		8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 5,900		
9. COST ESTIMATES							
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)		
ENGINEERING AND CONTRACT SUPPORT FACILITY		SF	47,700	97	4,627		
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					655		
COMMUNICATION SUPPORT		LS			(120)		
DEMOLITION		SF	49,000	4	(195)		
FIRE PROTECTION		LS			(90)		
PAVEMENTS		LS			(50)		
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(35)		
SPECIAL FOUNDATIONS		LS			(55)		
UTILITIES		LS			(110)		
SUBTOTAL					5,282		
CONTINGENCY (5%)					264		
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					5,546		
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					333		
TOTAL REQUEST					5,879		
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					5,900		
10. Description of Proposed Construction: A two-story structural steel and masonry building, reinforced concrete foundations and floors, prewired workstations. Includes space for engineers, technicians, and contracting staff; rooms for drawing reproduction equipment, technical library and electronic equipment testing; administrative area and other necessary support. Demolish eight facilities totaling 48,980 square feet. Air Conditioning: 90 Tons.							
11. REQUIREMENT: 47,700 SF ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 70,576 SF PROJECT: Construct an engineering and contracting support facility. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: A properly sized and configured facility to house the 1845th Engineering Installation Group (AFCC) engineering and contracting staff of more than 300 people. The engineers design communications, air traffic control, and weather system installations. The contracting staff buys commercial components based on plans and performance specifications developed by the engineers. These systems support Air Force, Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Presidentially-directed programs valued at more than \$3.25 billion. Examples are DOD Red Switch, Base Information Digital Distribution System, Milstar, and Next Generation Weather Radar programs. The proposed facility is part of an overall plan to replace the engineering and installation facilities through projects done sequentially in order to optimally use the existing real estate. CURRENT SITUATION: Engineering and contracting personnel occupy two-story, asbestos-sided, wood-framed Korean War vintage facilities originally built for use as dormitories. These facilities have deteriorated beyond economical repair. Basic structural members have extensive termite and water damage, floors have sunk and pulled away from							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION TINKER AIR FORCE BASE, OKLAHOMA		
4. PROJECT TITLE ENGINEERING AND CONTRACT SUPPORT FACILITY	5. PROJECT NUMBER WWYK923033	
<p>walls and ceilings, and buildings are poorly insulated. Mechanical and electrical systems have outlived their serviceable life. The base currently is providing interim fixes such as shoring up floors and expedient utility repairs that minimize the expenditure of scarce operations and maintenance resources. Eight substandard facilities totaling 48,980 square feet will be disposed of upon completion of this project.</p> <p>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: Existing facilities, even with continued repair, are not expected to remain habitable beyond 1994. At that time, the Air Force will need Title 10 authority for an off-base lease. No other space will be available on base for this requirement. This will delay the fielding of major Air Force, JCS, and Presidentially-directed systems. The existing facilities will continue to tie up base maintenance manpower and drain the base operations and maintenance funds totaling about \$100,000 annually. The worsening conditions of existing buildings over the past several years necessitate immediate construction of new</p> <p>ADDITIONAL: An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of new construction and revitalization. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, new construction was found to be more cost efficient over the life of the project. This project meets the criteria specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide."</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																																													
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION TINKER AIR FORCE BASE, OKLAHOMA																																															
4. PROJECT TITLE ENGINEERING AND CONTRACT SUPPORT FACILITY	5. PROJECT NUMBER WWYK923033																																														
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td colspan="3">(1) Status:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td></td> <td>92 AUG 21</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td></td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td></td> <td>92 OCT 14</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td></td> <td>93 SEP 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(2) Basis:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td></td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td></td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td></td> <td>366</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td></td> <td>188</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td></td> <td>554</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> <td>369</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td></td> <td>185</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(4) Construction Start</td> <td></td> <td>94 FEB</td> </tr> </table> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(1) Status:			(a) Date Design Started		92 AUG 21	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%	(c) Date 35% Designed		92 OCT 14	(d) Date Design Complete		93 SEP 01	(2) Basis:			(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A	(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)			(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		366	(b) All Other Design Costs		188	(c) Total		554	(d) Contract		369	(e) In-house		185	(4) Construction Start		94 FEB
(1) Status:																																															
(a) Date Design Started		92 AUG 21																																													
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%																																													
(c) Date 35% Designed		92 OCT 14																																													
(d) Date Design Complete		93 SEP 01																																													
(2) Basis:																																															
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO																																													
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A																																													
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)																																															
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		366																																													
(b) All Other Design Costs		188																																													
(c) Total		554																																													
(d) Contract		369																																													
(e) In-house		185																																													
(4) Construction Start		94 FEB																																													

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION TINKER AIR FORCE BASE, OKLAHOMA			4. PROJECT TITLE INDUSTRIAL WASTEWATER REGIONAL CONNECTION (DBOF)			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 7.80.56		6. CATEGORY CODE 831-155	7. PROJECT NUMBER WWYK943011	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 5,400		
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM					U/M	QUANTITY
INDUSTRIAL WASTEWATER REGIONAL CONNECTION (DBOF)					LS	
INDUSTRIAL WASTEWATER LINES					LF	15,000
LIFT STATIONS					EA	2
SUPPORTING FACILITIES						
UTILITIES					LS	
SITE IMPROVEMENTS					LS	
LEAK MONITORING SYSTEM					LS	
COMMINUTOR					LS	
SUBTOTAL						3,650
CONTINGENCY (5%)						(2,550)
TOTAL CONTRACT COST						(1,100)
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)						1,175
TOTAL REQUEST						(225)
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)						(300)
						(400)
						(250)
						4,825
						241
						5,066
						304
						5,370
						5,400
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Install a force and gravity flow wastewater connection main with an interstitial monitoring system. Includes pumps, valves, ancillary items and necessary support.						
11. REQUIREMENT: As required.						
<u>PROJECT</u> : Install a wastewater regional connection pipeline. (Current Mission)						
<u>REQUIREMENT</u> : This is a Level II environmental compliance project to provide a connection to the local municipal sewage collection system to allow Tinker AFB to meet permitted effluent limitations for wastewater discharge from the two base treatment plants. A sewage lift station and a section of forced mains are required to pump the effluent uphill from the base treatment plants, and a comminutor is needed to grind solids in the wastewater. Connection must be provided by August 1995 to ensure compliance.						
<u>CURRENT SITUATION</u> : Effluent from the existing industrial wastewater treatment plant (IWTP) and sanitary treatment plant (STP) discharges into an intermittent creek. The low water to effluent ratio at the point of discharge results in very low permit discharge limits for many constituents. The plants have a history of noncompliance. Both plants are barely meeting discharge limits. The current base discharge permit expires in August 1993. The state has indicated that upon renewal, the base's permit will contain even lower limits to meet Clean Water Act, Section 304(1) requirements for toxicity control. The IWTP could not meet lower limits without the benefit of a major upgrade. Upon completion of this project the IWTP would be retained as a pretreatment facility and the STP will be closed.						
<u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED</u> : The base industrial wastewater treatment plant						

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION TINKER AIR FORCE BASE, OKLAHOMA		
4. PROJECT TITLE INDUSTRIAL WASTEWATER REGIONAL CONNECTION (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER WWYK943011	
<p>will continue to exceed National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permitted limits for effluent discharge. Potential fines and possible plant closure may result. Plant closure will shut down critical depot maintenance operations, severely crippling depot mission accomplishment.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There is no criteria/scope for this project in either Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide" or AFM 86-2. All known alternative options were considered during the development of this project. No other option could meet the mission requirements; therefore, no economic analysis was needed or performed. A certificate of exemption has been prepared.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION TINKER AIR FORCE BASE, OKLAHOMA																								
4. PROJECT TITLE INDUSTRIAL WASTEWATER REGIONAL CONNECTION (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER WWYK943011																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="346 619 1435 745"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 AUG 16</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 OCT 06</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 DEC 01</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="346 808 1435 871"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="346 934 1435 1102"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>320</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>175</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>495</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>330</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>165</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 APR</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 AUG 16	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 OCT 06	(d) Date Design Complete	93 DEC 01	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	320	(b) All Other Design Costs	175	(c) Total	495	(d) Contract	330	(e) In-house	165
(a) Date Design Started	92 AUG 16																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 OCT 06																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 DEC 01																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	320																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	175																							
(c) Total	495																							
(d) Contract	330																							
(e) In-house	165																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)					2. DATE				
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION VANCE AIR FORCE BASE, OKLAHOMA				4. COMMAND AIR TRAINING COMMAND		5. AREA CONST COST INDEX 0.83					
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED		TOTAL	
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL		CIV
a. As of 30 SEP 92		355	398	92	204				1		1,050
b. End FY 1998		393	385	96	231				1		1,106
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (4,394)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)		77,705									
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:		7,500									
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:		6,000									
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)		3,650									
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:		23,700									
g. Remaining Deficiency:		0									
h. Grand Total:		118,555									
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE			SCOPE		COST (\$000)		DESIGN STATUS		
<u>CODE</u>									<u>START</u> <u>CMPL</u>		
136-664		UPGRADE AIRFIELD LIGHTING			46,800 LF		3,300		JUL 92 DEC 93		
442-000		T-1 SPECIALIZED UPT MAINTENANCE SUPPORT			26,000 SF		2,700		JUL 92 DEC 93		
							TOTAL:		6,000		
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995)											
179-511		FIRE TRAINING FACILITY			LS		750				
832-266		UPGRADE SANITARY SEWER SYSTEM			LS		1,100				
871-183		UPGRADE STORM DRAINAGE SYSTEM			LS		1,800				
							TOTAL:		3,650		
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
113-321		T-37 REPLACEMENT FACILITY MODIFICATIONS			LS		3,250				
211-111		MAINTENANCE HANGAR			53,000 SF		6,500				
219-944		BASE ENGINEERING COMPLEX			47,600 SF		5,000				
442-758		CONSOLIDATED LOGISTICS COMPLEX			119,700 SF		7,400				
812-223		REPAIR PRIMARY OVERHEAD DIST LINES - BASEWIDE			LS		1,550				
10. Mission or Major Functions: A flying training wing which conducts Undergraduate Pilot Training (UPT) with one T-37 squadron and one T-38 squadron. Also, base will undergo a T-37 to T-1 aircraft conversion.											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:		0									
b. Water pollution:		3,275									
c. Occupational safety and health:		0									
d. Other Environmental:		375									

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)				2. DATE		
AIR FORCE								
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION				4. PROJECT TITLE				
VANCE AIR FORCE BASE, OKLAHOMA				UPGRADE AIRFIELD LIGHTING				
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT		6. CATEGORY CODE	7. PROJECT NUMBER		8. PROJECT COST(\$000)			
8.57.96T		136-664	XTLF933303		3,300			
9. COST ESTIMATES								
ITEM					U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
UPGRADE AIRFIELD LIGHTING					LF	46,800		1,708
RUNWAY LIGHTING 17L/35R					LF	23,400	46	(1,076)
TAXIWAY LIGHTING					LF	23,400	27	(632)
SUPPORTING FACILITIES								1,115
DISTANCE MARKERS/WIND CONES					LS			(110)
THRESHOLD LIGHTING/RW END INDICATOR					LS			(665)
SALS APPROACH LIGHTING/FLASHERS					LS			(290)
VISUAL GLIDESLOPE INDICATOR					LS			(50)
SUBTOTAL								2,823
CONTINGENCY (10%)								282
TOTAL CONTRACT COST								3,105
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)								186
TOTAL REQUEST								3,291
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)								3,300
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Upgrade the airfield lighting on the three north-south parallel runways and associated taxiways. Work shall include: installation of lighting fixtures and equipment on the inside runway (17L-35R) to convert it for nighttime operations, replacement of existing fixtures and equipment on the center (17C-35C) and outside (17R-35L) runways and taxiways with state-of-the-art systems.								
11. REQUIREMENT: As required. PROJECT: Upgrade airfield lighting. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: This project is required to properly modify, upgrade and standardize existing visual navigational aid facilities to FAA and Air Force standards. This will improve operational safety, reliability and efficiency of the airfield through the use of equipment, fixtures and materials that can be adequately maintained. This lighting upgrade was identified in the 1988 Master Planning Study of Airfield Lighting Systems at Vance AFB and is required for the proper training and safety of inexperienced student pilots. CURRENT SITUATION: Inexperienced student pilots fly 260 sorties per day to comply with the strict flying syllabus. Lack of runway lighting on the inside runway limits operations to only one type of aircraft at night to avoid marginally safe in-flight separation of aircraft. Threshold and runway edge lights do not provide high-intensity lighting required by Air Force directives. Visual glide slope indicators and other lighting equipment are both difficult and expensive to maintain. Existing cables have excessive current losses associated with advanced stages of insulation deterioration. IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: Safety of pilots are in jeopardy if landings are attempted during outages. Night flying capacity will continue to be								

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION VANCE AIR FORCE BASE, OKLAHOMA		
4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE AIRFIELD LIGHTING	5. PROJECT NUMBER XTLF933303	
<p>limited to one type of aircraft.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL</u>: An economic analysis was not prepared because this project directly supports a mission function for which there is no available alternative but to upgrade the airfield lighting. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements".</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																																													
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION VANCE AIR FORCE BASE, OKLAHOMA																																															
4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE AIRFIELD LIGHTING	5. PROJECT NUMBER XTLF933303																																														
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td colspan="3">(1) Status:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td></td> <td>92 JUL 02</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td></td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td></td> <td>92 OCT 29</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td></td> <td>93 DEC 20</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(2) Basis:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td></td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td></td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td></td> <td>210</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td></td> <td>106</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td></td> <td>316</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> <td>236</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td></td> <td>80</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(4) Construction Start</td> <td></td> <td>94 MAR</td> </tr> </table> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(1) Status:			(a) Date Design Started		92 JUL 02	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%	(c) Date 35% Designed		92 OCT 29	(d) Date Design Complete		93 DEC 20	(2) Basis:			(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A	(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)			(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		210	(b) All Other Design Costs		106	(c) Total		316	(d) Contract		236	(e) In-house		80	(4) Construction Start		94 MAR
(1) Status:																																															
(a) Date Design Started		92 JUL 02																																													
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%																																													
(c) Date 35% Designed		92 OCT 29																																													
(d) Date Design Complete		93 DEC 20																																													
(2) Basis:																																															
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO																																													
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A																																													
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)																																															
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		210																																													
(b) All Other Design Costs		106																																													
(c) Total		316																																													
(d) Contract		236																																													
(e) In-house		80																																													
(4) Construction Start		94 MAR																																													

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)				2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION VANCE AIR FORCE BASE, OKLAHOMA				4. PROJECT TITLE T-1 SPECIALIZED UPT MAINTENANCE SUPPORT			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 8.47.41		6. CATEGORY CODE 442-000		7. PROJECT NUMBER XTLF933002		8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 2,700	
9. COST ESTIMATES							
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)		
T-1 SPECIALIZED UPT MAINTENANCE SUPPORT		SF	26,000		2,247		
COMBS WAREHOUSE		SF	17,500	50	(875)		
SIMULATOR CONTRACTOR LOGISTIC SUPPORT		SF	8,500	77	(655)		
ALTER IN-FLIGHT SIMULATOR FACILITY		LS			(147)		
CENTRALIZED AIRCRAFT SUPPPORT SYSTEM		EA	38	13,290	(505)		
ALTER OPERATIONAL FACILITIES		LS			(65)		
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					170		
UTILITIES/COMMUNICATIONS SUPPORT		LS			(79)		
PAVEMENTS/SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(100)		
SUBTOTAL					2,417		
CONTINGENCY (5%)					121		
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					2,538		
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					152		
TOTAL REQUEST					2,690		
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					2,700		
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Masonry building with concrete floor slab and foundation to house a Contractor Managed Base Supply (COMBS) function. Also includes modifying hangars and simulator facility, installing centralized aircraft support system (CASS), tie-down and grounding points, and other necessary support. Air Conditioning: 5 Tons.							
11. REQUIREMENT: As required. <u>PROJECT</u> : Construct a Contractor Operated and Managed Base Supply (COMBS) facility and modify facilities and systems to leddown the T-1 Jayhawk trainer aircraft. (New Mission) <u>REQUIREMENT</u> : Per contract agreement, an integrated logistics support facility is to be provided to the contractor responsible for maintenance of 40 T-1 Jayhawk aircraft. The mission change will require enlargement of the flight training facilities for the new simulator contractor's support and management area, modifications to the in-flight simulator facility and other operational facilities, and the installation of a centralized aircraft support system (CASS) to start and maintain the aircraft while on the ramp. <u>CURRENT SITUATION</u> : Vance AFB is currently an Undergraduate Pilot Training (UPT) base and utilizes both T-37 and T-38 aircraft. All facilities are configured for these airframes, which the T-1 Jayhawk aircraft is 9.7' wider than the T-37 and 18.1' wider than the T-38. Existing facilities are not available on the flightline for the COMBS warehouse/office function. This function must provide rapid response to parts replacement and secure storage of contractor owned parts. Simulator bays will need to be modified to permit the new simulator to be installed. Two additional floors must be constructed in one of the terrain model board rooms for							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION VANCE AIR FORCE BASE, OKLAHOMA		
4. PROJECT TITLE T-1 SPECIALIZED UPT MAINTENANCE SUPPORT	5. PROJECT NUMBER XTLF933002	
<p>simulator contractor support for the T-1 Jayhawk trainer. The ramp parking plan must be altered and a new CASS system installed to support the new aircraft. First aircraft is scheduled for delivery in February 1995.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Failure to accomplish this project will impact overall mission capabilities and jeopardize the beddown of the T-1 Jayhawk aircraft. Will be in violation of a contract agreement resulting in contractor claims.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> An economic analysis was not prepared for this project because there is only one method possible to accomplish the objective. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements".</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION VANCE AIR FORCE BASE, OKLAHOMA																								
4. PROJECT TITLE T-1 SPECIALIZED UPT MAINTENANCE SUPPORT	5. PROJECT NUMBER XTLF933002																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="355 619 1428 766"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 JUL 16</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>15%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 OCT 23</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 DEC 15</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="355 819 1428 892"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>YES</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>REESE</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="355 945 1428 1113"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>162</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>54</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>216</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>156</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>60</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 MAR</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 JUL 16	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	15%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 OCT 23	(d) Date Design Complete	93 DEC 15	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	YES	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	REESE	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	162	(b) All Other Design Costs	54	(c) Total	216	(d) Contract	156	(e) In-house	60
(a) Date Design Started	92 JUL 16																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	15%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 OCT 23																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 DEC 15																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	YES																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	REESE																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	162																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	54																							
(c) Total	216																							
(d) Contract	156																							
(e) In-house	60																							

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)						2. DATE			
AIR FORCE											
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION				4. COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX				
CHARLESTON AIR FORCE BASE, SOUTH CAROLINA				AIR MOBILITY COMMAND			0.91				
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			TOTAL
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	
a. As of 30 SEP 92		533	3642	1134	103	306	5	1	3	2	5,729
b. End FY 1998		484	2714	1009	103	306	5	1	3	2	4,627
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (6,235)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)										145,509	
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:										65,700	
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:										1,100	
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)										13,600	
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:										21,500	
g. Remaining Deficiency:										0	
h. Grand Total:										247,409	
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE		SCOPE		COST (\$000)		DESIGN STATUS			
<u>CODE</u>								<u>START</u>		<u>CMPL</u>	
179-511		FIRE TRAINING FACILITY (DBOF)		LS		1,100		JUN 92		JUN 93	
						TOTAL:		1,100			
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995)											
121-000		C-17 ADD TO AND ALTER APRON/ HYDRANT FUELING SYSTEM, PH III		LS		7,500					
211-153		C-17 ADD TO AND ALTER AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE AND NDI SHOP		4,900 SF		3,500					
442-257		ALTER BASE HAZ MATERIALS STORAGE		LS		1,500					
811-149		AIRFIELD LIGHTING VAULT		3,000 SF		1,100					
						TOTAL:		13,600			
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
211-000		AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE		24,000 SF		4,400					
219-000		BASE ENGINEERING COMPLEX		41,000 SF		5,600					
442-257		BASE HAZ MATERIALS STORAGE		9,600 SF		1,300					
721-315		ALTER VISITING AIRMEN DORMITORY		420 PN		5,000					
843-315		ADD TO AND ALTER FIRE HYDRANTS		24,000 LF		1,750					
10. Mission or Major Functions: An airlift wing which includes four C-141 squadrons; an Air Force Reserve C-141 associate airlift wing; and an Air National Guard fighter interceptor detachment with F-16 aircraft. A joint military/civil use airfield. Also, primary base to receive new C-17 aircraft.											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:										0	
b. Water pollution:										0	
c. Occupational safety and health:										0	
d. Other Environmental:										1,450	

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)		2. DATE	
AIR FORCE					
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION CHARLESTON AIR FORCE BASE, SOUTH CAROLINA			4. PROJECT TITLE FIRE TRAINING FACILITY (DBOF)		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT	6. CATEGORY CODE	7. PROJECT NUMBER	8. PROJECT COST(\$000)		
4.18.56	179-511	DKFX963500	1,100		
9. COST ESTIMATES					
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
FIRE TRAINING FACILITY (DBOF)		EA	1	815,000	815
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					155
UTILITIES		LS			(60)
PAVEMENTS		SY	1,300	35	(45)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(50)
SUBTOTAL					970
CONTINGENCY (5%)					49
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					1,019
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					61
TOTAL REQUEST					1,080
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					1,100
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Live fire training facility with large frame aircraft mock-up, polyethylene liner system, JP-4 fuel pump and piping system, commercial power hook-up, gravity oil/water separator, access road, effluent holding pond and all necessary support.					
11. REQUIREMENT: 1 LS ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 1 LS PROJECT: Construct fire training facility. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: This is a Level II environmental compliance project. A live fire training facility is required to meet all environmental and safety regulations. Live fire training exercises, an FAA quarterly requirement, enable fire fighters to maintain a high level of proficiency by extinguishing two types of live fires: mass fuel spills and three dimensional (running fuel) fires. These exercises, performed on mock-ups typical of the mission assigned aircraft, have created compliance problems with the Clean Water Act. An impermeable lining below the pit area is required to prevent waste oils and fuels from leaching into the ground and contaminating the groundwater. CURRENT SITUATION: The existing live fire training facility violated EPA pollution standards and was closed in 1984. It is inadequate for training as defined by Air Force regulation. The current aircraft mock-up is smaller than the required size and is not accessible for multi-directional approaches creating an artificial environment which limits the quality of training. The existing facility does not have high-density polyethylene flexible membrane liners and nets, a leak detection system, and spill containment capability. There are no environmentally approved live fire training facilities in the local area. IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: The existing facility is closed because it does not meet environmental requirements. Required live fire training for the					

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION CHARLESTON AIR FORCE BASE, SOUTH CAROLINA		
4. PROJECT TITLE FIRE TRAINING FACILITY (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER DKFX963500	
<p>assigned fire fighters is not available. Without the stress and realism that come only with live fires, the fire fighters lose proficiency in combating fires. The potential for loss of aircraft and life is increased.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There are no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". This project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements". Project has been considered for FY97 force structure end strength.</p>		

1. COMPONENT	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
AIR FORCE		
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION		
CHARLESTON AIR FORCE BASE, SOUTH CAROLINA		
4. PROJECT TITLE		5. PROJECT NUMBER
FIRE TRAINING FACILITY (DBOF)		DKFX963500
12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:		
a. Estimated Design Data:		
(1) Status:		
(a) Date Design Started		92 JUN 30
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		65%
(c) Date 35% Designed		92 SEP 15
(d) Date Design Complete		93 JUN 25
(2) Basis:		
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		YES
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		SCOTT
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)		
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		57
(b) All Other Design Costs		19
(c) Total		76
(d) Contract		57
(e) In-house		19
(4) Construction Start		93 DEC
b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A		

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)							2. DATE		
AIR FORCE											
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION					4. COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX			
SHAW AIR FORCE BASE, SOUTH CAROLINA					AIR COMBAT COMMAND			0.83			
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	TOTAL
a. As of 30 SEP 92		746	4579	518	16	26	252	11	42	9	6,199
b. End FY 1998		705	4465	556	16	26	252	11	42	9	6,082
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (3,416)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)										157,483	
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:										11,080	
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:										5,870	
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)										0	
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:										15,000	
g. Remaining Deficiency:										0	
h. Grand Total:										189,433	
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE			SCOPE		COST (\$000)		DESIGN STATUS		
CODE									START		CMPL
149-962		CONTROL TOWER			1 EA		2,700		AUG 92		APR 93
411-135		UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS			LS		520		JUL		DEC 92
740-884		CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER			24,500 SF		2,650		SEP 92		JUN 93
							TOTAL:		5,870		
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995) NONE											
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
113-321		REPLACE APRON 3			LS		3,000				
211-179		FUEL SYSTEMS MAINTENANCE DOCK			18,500 SF		2,800				
722-351		DINING FACILITY AND TROOP ISSUE WAREHOUSE			24,000 SF		3,800				
730-835		SECURITY POLICE OPERATIONS			12,000 SF		1,600				
740-675		BASE LIBRARY & EDUCATION CENTER			32,000 SF		3,800				
10. Mission or Major Functions: Headquarters Ninth Air Force; a fighter wing which includes three fighter squadrons (F-16 aircraft) and one air control squadron (OA-10 and A-10 aircraft). Also, the temporary beddown location of one F-16 squadron from Homestead AFB, FL.											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:										0	
b. Water pollution:										6,500	
c. Occupational safety and health:										0	
d. Other Environmental:										0	

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)		2. DATE	
AIR FORCE					
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION			4. PROJECT TITLE		
SHAW AIR FORCE BASE, SOUTH CAROLINA			CONTROL TOWER		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT	6. CATEGORY CODE	7. PROJECT NUMBER	8. PROJECT COST(\$000)		
3.51.14	149-962	VLSB943002	2,700		
9. COST ESTIMATES					
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
CONTROL TOWER		LS			1,552
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					870
UTILITIES		LS			(255)
PAVEMENTS		LS			(90)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(35)
FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEMS		LS			(10)
COMMUNICATION SUPPORT		LS			(290)
SPECIAL FOUNDATION		LS			(25)
AIRFIELD WIRING		LS			(115)
DEMOLITION		LS			(50)
SUBTOTAL					2,422
CONTINGENCY (5%)					121
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					2,543
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					153
TOTAL REQUEST					2,696
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					2,700
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Reinforced concrete footings, special foundation, floor slab, supporting superstructure, control tower cab, operations and training areas. Facility includes elevator, all site work, utilities, mechanical, electrical, fire protection and backup power systems. Existing tower will be demolished. Air Conditioning: 20 Tons.					
11. REQUIREMENT: 1 EA ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 1 EA PROJECT: Construct an 86-foot high air traffic control tower with a 540 square foot cab. (Current Mission). REQUIREMENT: A new air traffic control tower with larger cab to accommodate up to 11 air traffic control personnel, air traffic control equipment, crew briefings, operations, and training functions. CURRENT SITUATION: The existing control tower was constructed in 1956. The 225 SF tower cab was configured to accommodate three controllers and the standard compliment of 1950s vintage equipment. The base mission and characteristics of aircraft supported have significantly changed since then, and more air traffic controllers and equipment are needed now to cover the current air operation. Furthermore, changes in airport configuration, air traffic patterns and visual obstructions to controllers make the proposed tower site more desirable than the existing site. Air traffic control operations at Shaw number 120,000 landings and take-offs annually. Shaw AFB is home base for three F-16 squadrons and one A/OA-10 squadron. IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: Overcrowded cab conditions limit air traffic controller mobility and impact controller communications with pilots. These conditions, coupled with the additional effort required to safely control multiple F-16, A-10 and OA-10 aircraft during routine operations,					

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION SHAW AIR FORCE BASE, SOUTH CAROLINA		
4. PROJECT TITLE CONTROL TOWER	5. PROJECT NUMBER VLSB943002	
<p>create conditions that could jeopardize pilot safety and cause aircraft loss.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> The project is part of the Air Force Control Tower upgrade program managed by Air Force Communications Command (AFCC). Upon completion of this project, the existing tower will be demolished. The economic analysis for this project considered three alternatives: status quo, modify the existing tower, and construct a new tower. Status quo would not eliminate all deficiencies, and tower modification was determined to be technically infeasible. New construction is the only viable alternative. There are no criteria for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide," or in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements."</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION SHAW AIR FORCE BASE, SOUTH CAROLINA																								
4. PROJECT TITLE CONTROL TOWER	5. PROJECT NUMBER VLSB943002																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="327 629 1367 757"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 AUG 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>90%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 SEP 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 APR 01</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="327 825 1367 885"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="327 953 1367 1110"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>162</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>81</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>243</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>162</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>81</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 AUG 01	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	90%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 SEP 01	(d) Date Design Complete	93 APR 01	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	162	(b) All Other Design Costs	81	(c) Total	243	(d) Contract	162	(e) In-house	81
(a) Date Design Started	92 AUG 01																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	90%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 SEP 01																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 APR 01																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	162																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	81																							
(c) Total	243																							
(d) Contract	162																							
(e) In-house	81																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION SHAW AIR FORCE BASE, SOUTH CAROLINA			4. PROJECT TITLE CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 2.75.96C		6. CATEGORY CODE 740-884	7. PROJECT NUMBER VLSB903015	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 2,650		
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER		SF	24,500	81	1,985	
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					405	
UTILITIES		LS			(250)	
PAVEMENTS		SY	2,000	40	(80)	
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(75)	
SUBTOTAL					2,390	
CONTINGENCY (5%)					120	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					2,510	
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					151	
TOTAL REQUEST					2,661	
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					2,650	
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Reinforced concrete foundation and floor slab, structural frame, masonry exterior, roof system, utilities, parking, playground, covered walkway and necessary support. Air Conditioning: 40 Tons.						
11. REQUIREMENT: 24,500 SF ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 10,500 SF <u>PROJECT</u> : Construct a child development center. (Current Mission) <u>REQUIREMENT</u> : A properly sized and functionally configured facility to provide supervised care and development experience for all eligible patrons. The current waiting list of 107 military children and 50 civilian eligible users validates this requirement. The facility must provide a comfortable, safe, and clean environment where patrons can leave their children on an hourly, or drop-in basis, without worrying about the level or nature of care. <u>CURRENT SITUATION</u> : There are presently over 150 children on the waiting list for child care at Shaw AFB. Until recently child care services were provided out of two substandard facilities. In April 1990, one of the facilities was condemned due to severe structural problems from termite damage uncovered during an asbestos removal contract. The base is currently leasing a 3,360 SF modular classroom at a cost of \$2,954 per month to enable continuation of child care services. The second facility is being used on an interim basis until a new facility can be constructed. The inadequacy of the existing child care facility and the shortage of on-base child care services creates serious hardships for personnel, especially single parents, who are unable to obtain adequate child care and is particularly trying during no-notice mission exercises. Demands have forced more of our young enlisted and junior officer families to pay a higher price for off-base child care.						

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION SHAW AIR FORCE BASE, SOUTH CAROLINA		
4. PROJECT TITLE CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	5. PROJECT NUMBER VLSB903015	
<p>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: Eligible patrons will continue to be denied service. Personnel must continue to use expensive off-base programs or place children in unlicensed babysitting situations. This results in an additional hardship on military parents and degrades the morale, productivity and career satisfaction of the force.</p> <p>ADDITIONAL: An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of new construction, revitalization, leasing and status quo operation. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, new construction was found to be the most cost efficient over the life of the project. This project meets the criteria/scope specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide".</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION SHAW AIR FORCE BASE, SOUTH CAROLINA																								
4. PROJECT TITLE CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	5. PROJECT NUMBER VLSB903015																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="330 609 1404 756"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 SEP 02</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 SEP 23</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 JUN 18</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="330 798 1404 882"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="330 924 1404 1113"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>130</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>114</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>244</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>174</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>70</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 FEB</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 SEP 02	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 SEP 23	(d) Date Design Complete	93 JUN 18	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	130	(b) All Other Design Costs	114	(c) Total	244	(d) Contract	174	(e) In-house	70
(a) Date Design Started	92 SEP 02																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 SEP 23																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 JUN 18																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	130																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	114																							
(c) Total	244																							
(d) Contract	174																							
(e) In-house	70																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)						2. DATE			
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ELLSWORTH AIR FORCE BASE, SOUTH DAKOTA				4. COMMAND AIR COMBAT COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX 1.02				
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED		TOTAL	
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL		CIV
a. As of 30 SEP 92		870	5067	494	34	76	12				6,553
b. End FY 1998		616	3385	480	34	76	12				4,603
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (6,470)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)		410,072									
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:		30,420									
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:		630									
e. Authorization Included in Following Program: (FY 1995)		8,930									
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:		51,050									
g. Remaining Deficiency:		0									
h. Grand Total:		501,102									
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE		SCOPE		COST (\$000)		DESIGN STATUS			
<u>CODE</u>								<u>START</u>		<u>CMPL</u>	
211-173		ALTER AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE DOCK		LS		630		AUG 92		APR 93	
				TOTAL:		630					
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995)											
124-000		UPGRADE POL DIKES AND BASINS		LS		1,230					
610-128		CONSOLIDATED ADMINISTRATION SUPPORT PH1		38,005 SF		6,200					
871-183		STORM DRAINAGE FACILITIES		LS		1,500					
				TOTAL:		8,930					
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
113-321		UPGRADE AIRCRAFT PARKING APRON		LS		10,300					
121-122		UPGRADE HYDRANT FUELING SYSTEM		LS		17,200					
141-461		USAF COMMAND POST		10,000 SF		3,900					
610-000		CONSOLIDATED MANAGEMENT SUPPORT CENTER (PH 3)		41,650 SF		5,700					
841-161		ADD TO AND ALTER WATER SUPPLY SYSTEM		45,200 LF		4,400					
10. Mission or Major Functions: A bomb wing which includes two B-1 squadrons; a missile wing with two Minuteman intercontinental ballistic missile squadrons; a tactics and training wing (responsible for combat situation training of all ACC bomber crews); a combat air rescue detachment with HH-1 helicopters; and an Air Mobility Command air refueling squadron (KC-135 aircraft).											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:		0									
b. Water pollution:		7,730									
c. Occupational safety and health:		0									
d. Other Environmental:		0									

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)							2. DATE		
AIR FORCE											
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION					4. COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX			
ARNOLD AIR FORCE BASE, TENNESSEE					AIR FORCE MATERIEL COMMAND			0.90			
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			TOTAL
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	
a. As of 30 SEP 92		74	58	199							331
b. End FY 1998		70	48	197							315
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (39,081)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)		1,059,660									
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:		2,400									
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:		1,500									
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)		6,800									
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:		20,800									
g. Remaining Deficiency:		0									
h. Grand Total:		1,091,160									
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE		SCOPE		COST (\$000)		DESIGN STATUS			
CODE								START		CML	
831-165		UPGRADE SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT		LS		1,500		SEP 92		AUG 93	
				TOTAL:		1,500					
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995)											
130-142		UPGRADE FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM		6,800 SF		3,500					
800-000		ALTER COOLING WATER SYSTEM		LS		3,300					
				TOTAL:		6,800					
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
219-944		BASE MAINTENANCE SHOP		24,960 SF		3,000					
411-139		HARDER UTILITY VULNERABILITY, SPECIAL FUEL STORAGE		LS		4,800					
610-811		SECURE STORAGE VAULT		2,400 SF		1,000					
821-113		ALTER STEAM AND CONDENSATE SYS TEM		012,286 SF		1,100					
844-367		BASE FACILITY COOLING TOWER		1 EA		10,900					
10. Mission or Major Functions: Arnold Engineering Development Center which conducts research, development, testing, and evaluation in support of aerospace system acquisition. The complex of wind tunnels, jet and rocket engine test cells, space simulation chambers, and hyperballistic ranges is the largest in the U. S.											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:		2,000									
b. Water pollution:		1,000									
c. Occupational safety and health:		0									
d. Other Environmental:		2,600									

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)				2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ARNOLD AIR FORCE BASE, TENNESSEE			4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT				
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 7.80.56		6. CATEGORY CODE 831-165	7. PROJECT NUMBER ANZY870369		8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 1,500		
9. COST ESTIMATES							
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)		
UPGRADE SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT		LS			1,050		
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					240		
UTILITIES		LS			(110)		
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(30)		
O&M MANUAL, TRAINING AND START-UP		LS			(100)		
SUBTOTAL					1,290		
CONTINGENCY (10%)					129		
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					1,419		
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					85		
TOTAL REQUEST					1,504		
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					1,500		
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Upgrade sewage treatment plant by adding primary and secondary settling basins, a grit removal system, rebuilding sludge drying beds and replacing/upgrading trickling filter components, pumps, meters, a pump station and ancillary items. Upgrade laboratories and provide pretreatment facilities at steam plants, necessary support, O&M manuals and 180 day start-up operation and training.							
11. REQUIREMENT: As required. PROJECT: Upgrade a sewage treatment plant. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: This is a Level I environmental compliance project. An adequate sewage treatment plant is required to treat sewage and waste water. The treatment process must produce an effluent which meets federal and State of Tennessee water quality standards, as required by a permit issued under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) and the Clean Water Act, as amended. CURRENT SITUATION: The existing sewage treatment plant does not consistently meet the discharge limits required by the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) and State of Tennessee. Limits were exceeded 22 times in 1990. Arnold AFB has received one notice of violation for the operation of the plant during 1990. This leaves the plant in noncompliance with its permit, State of Tennessee regulations and the Clean Water Act. Lack of recirculation basins often results in the trickling filter running dry or operating too rapidly. The hydraulic capacity of the plant is exceeded about 75 percent of the time. The lack of duplicate primary settling tanks violates current environmental regulations and precludes taking a unit out of service for periodic maintenance. The plant capacity is 230 thousand gallons per day (TGD), but the flow has averaged 298 TGD over a recent 12-month period.							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ARNOLD AIR FORCE BASE, TENNESSEE		
4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT	5. PROJECT NUMBER ANZY870369	
<p>Inadequate facilities preclude effective operation of the sludge digestion equipment, which results in handling of foul smelling sludge. Discharge from the plant enters Woods Reservoir, which is a source of drinking water for Arnold AFB. Discharge of inadequately treated sewage into drinking water sources is not permissible and is a violation of the plant's permit.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> The sewage treatment plant would continue to be out of compliance with its permit limits and the Clean Water Act. Arnold AFB will potentially be exposed to fines ranging from \$10,000 per day per violation. Significant adverse public reaction can be expected for continued violations.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements".</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																																													
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ARNOLD AIR FORCE BASE, TENNESSEE																																															
4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT	5. PROJECT NUMBER ANZY870369																																														
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td colspan="3">(1) Status:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td></td> <td>92 SEP 28</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td></td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td></td> <td>92 DEC 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td></td> <td>93 AUG 16</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(2) Basis:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td></td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td></td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td></td> <td>51</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td></td> <td>84</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td></td> <td>135</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> <td>85</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td></td> <td>50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(4) Construction Start</td> <td></td> <td>93 DEC</td> </tr> </table> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(1) Status:			(a) Date Design Started		92 SEP 28	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%	(c) Date 35% Designed		92 DEC 15	(d) Date Design Complete		93 AUG 16	(2) Basis:			(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A	(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)			(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		51	(b) All Other Design Costs		84	(c) Total		135	(d) Contract		85	(e) In-house		50	(4) Construction Start		93 DEC
(1) Status:																																															
(a) Date Design Started		92 SEP 28																																													
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%																																													
(c) Date 35% Designed		92 DEC 15																																													
(d) Date Design Complete		93 AUG 16																																													
(2) Basis:																																															
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO																																													
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A																																													
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)																																															
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		51																																													
(b) All Other Design Costs		84																																													
(c) Total		135																																													
(d) Contract		85																																													
(e) In-house		50																																													
(4) Construction Start		93 DEC																																													

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)						2. DATE			
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION MEMPHIS NAVAL AIR STATION, TENNESSEE				4. COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX 0.00				
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			TOTAL
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	
a. As of 30 SEP 92											
b. End FY 1998											
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (0)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)										0	
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:										0	
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:										6,200	
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)										0	
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:										0	
g. Remaining Deficiency:										0	
h. Grand Total:										6,200	
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE			SCOPE		COST (\$000)	DESIGN STATUS			
<u>CODE</u>								<u>START</u>		<u>CMPL</u>	
171-621		ALTER TECHNICAL TRAINING FACILITY			49,650 SF		2,000	OCT 92		SEP 93	
171-625		ADD TO AND ALTER HIGH-BAY TECHNICAL TRAINING FACILITY			25,000 SF		3,000	OCT 92		DEC 93	
721-315		RENOVATE DORMITORY			42,000 SF		1,200	OCT 92		AUG 93	
		TOTAL:					6,200				
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995) NONE											
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:										0	
b. Water pollution:										0	
c. Occupational safety and health:										0	
d. Other Environmental:										0	

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)		2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION MEMPHIS NAVAL AIR STATION, TENNESSEE			4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO AND ALTER HIGH-BAY TECHNICAL TRAINING FACILITY		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 8.47.31	6. CATEGORY CODE 171-625	7. PROJECT NUMBER DJDB948002	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 3,000		
9. COST ESTIMATES					
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
ADD TO AND ALTER HIGH-BAY TECHNICAL TRAINING FACILITY		SF	25,000		2,353
ALTERATION		SF	1,600	8	(13)
ADDITION		SF	23,400	100	(2,340)
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					195
UTILITIES/COMMUNICATIONS		LS			(195)
SUBTOTAL					2,548
CONTINGENCY (10%)					255
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					2,803
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					168
TOTAL REQUEST					2,971
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					3,000
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Construct classroom and laboratory space in existing high-bay area, to include all necessary supporting features.					
11. REQUIREMENT: 25,000 SF ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 18,700 SF PROJECT: Add to and alter high-bay technical training facility. (New Mission) REQUIREMENT: Classrooms and laboratories of adequate size and configuration to support Air Force aircraft structures training. Additional square footage will be provided by a new mezzanine in the part of the existing high bay area. CURRENT SITUATION: Existing facilities are not adequate for the total training and housing requirements to support consolidation and collocation of Air Force aircraft structures training with the Navy at Memphis Naval Air Station. IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: Aircraft structures training cannot be accomplished jeopardizing the realignment from and closure of Chanute AFB and the production of qualified technicians. ADDITIONAL: Aircraft structures training initially was moving to Sheppard AFB with the closure of Chanute AFB and was in the BRAC program. After an Interservice Training Review Organization (ITRO) study, \$10 million in additional savings was identified by combining this training at Memphis NAS. Since BRAC funds were appropriated to move this training to Sheppard AFB, BRAC funds cannot be used to move training to Memphis NAS. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements".					

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION MEMPHIS NAVAL AIR STATION, TENNESSEE																								
4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO AND ALTER HIGH-BAY TECHNICAL TRAINING FACILITY	5. PROJECT NUMBER DJDB948002																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="322 619 1395 745"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 OCT 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 DEC 30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 DEC 15</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="322 808 1395 871"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="322 934 1395 1102"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>162</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>86</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>248</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>210</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>38</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 MAR</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 OCT 15	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 DEC 30	(d) Date Design Complete	93 DEC 15	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	162	(b) All Other Design Costs	86	(c) Total	248	(d) Contract	210	(e) In-house	38
(a) Date Design Started	92 OCT 15																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 DEC 30																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 DEC 15																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	162																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	86																							
(c) Total	248																							
(d) Contract	210																							
(e) In-house	38																							

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)		2. DATE	
AIR FORCE					
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION			4. PROJECT TITLE		
MEMPHIS NAVAL AIR STATION, TENNESSEE			ALTER TECHNICAL TRAINING FACILITY		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT	6. CATEGORY CODE	7. PROJECT NUMBER	8. PROJECT COST(\$000)		
8.47.31	171-621	DJDB948003	2,000		
9. COST ESTIMATES					
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
ALTER TECHNICAL TRAINING FACILITY		SF	49,700		1,595
TECHNICAL TRAINING LABORATORY		SF	6,400	80	(512)
TECHNICAL TRAINING CLASSROOM		SF	43,300	25	(1,083)
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					100
UTILITIES/COMMUNICATIONS		SF	2,500	4	(10)
WORKSTATIONS		EA	26	3,462	(90)
SUBTOTAL					1,695
CONTINGENCY (10%)					170
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					1,865
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					112
TOTAL REQUEST					1,977
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					2,000
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Alter technical training building to include construction of partitions and dropped ceilings, and alterations to the electrical system, air conditioning/humidity control system, ventilation/exhaust system, vacuum system, and plumbing.					
11. REQUIREMENT: 49,700 SF ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 49,700 SF PROJECT: Alter technical training facility. (New Mission) REQUIREMENT: Classrooms and laboratories of adequate size, configuration and with proper support systems for the nondestructive inspection, structural, and composite repair training of the Air Force aircraft structures training program. CURRENT SITUATION: Existing facilities are not adequate for the total training and housing requirements to support consolidation and collocation of Air Force aircraft structures training with the Navy at Memphis Naval Air Station. IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: Aircraft structures training cannot be accomplished jeopardizing the realignment from and closure of Chanute AFB and the production of qualified technicians. ADDITIONAL: Aircraft structures training initially was moving to Sheppard AFB with the closure of Chanute AFB and was in the BRAC program. After an Interservice Training Review organization (ITRO) study, \$10 million in additional savings was identified by combining this training at Memphis NAS. Since BRAC funds were appropriated to move this training to Sheppard AFB, BRAC funds cannot be used to move training to Memphis NAS. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements".					

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION MEMPHIS NAVAL AIR STATION, TENNESSEE																								
4. PROJECT TITLE ALTER TECHNICAL TRAINING FACILITY	5. PROJECT NUMBER DJDB948003																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="360 625 1404 758"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 OCT 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 DEC 20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 SEP 15</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="360 821 1321 884"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="360 947 1404 1104"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>105</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>56</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>161</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>140</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>21</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 OCT 15	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 DEC 20	(d) Date Design Complete	93 SEP 15	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	105	(b) All Other Design Costs	56	(c) Total	161	(d) Contract	140	(e) In-house	21
(a) Date Design Started	92 OCT 15																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 DEC 20																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 SEP 15																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	105																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	56																							
(c) Total	161																							
(d) Contract	140																							
(e) In-house	21																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)				2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION MEMPHIS NAVAL AIR STATION, TENNESSEE			4. PROJECT TITLE RENOVATE DORMITORY				
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 8.47.31		6. CATEGORY CODE 721-315	7. PROJECT NUMBER DJDB948001		8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 1,200		
9. COST ESTIMATES							
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)		
RENOVATE DORMITORY (375 PN)		SF	42,000	25	1,050		
SUBTOTAL					1,050		
CONTINGENCY (10%)					105		
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					1,155		
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					69		
TOTAL REQUEST					1,224		
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					1,200		
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Renovate enlisted dormitory and detached administrative space to include replacement of damaged ceiling tiles, new doors to restrooms, new carpet, and paint walls. Grade Mix: 275 E1-E4; 100 E5-E6.							
11. REQUIREMENT: 42,000 SF ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 42,000 SF PROJECT: Renovate dormitory and detached management space. (New Mission) REQUIREMENT: Adequate student housing and supporting management space to house Air Force students attending aircraft structures training. CURRENT SITUATION: Existing facilities are not adequate for the total training and housing requirements to support consolidation and collocation of Air Force aircraft structures training with the Navy at Memphis Naval Air Station. IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: Aircraft structures training cannot be accomplished jeopardizing the realignment from and closure of Chanute AFB and the production of qualified technicians. ADDITIONAL: This project meets the criteria/scope specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide".							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION MEMPHIS NAVAL AIR STATION, TENNESSEE																								
4. PROJECT TITLE RENOVATE DORMITORY	5. PROJECT NUMBER DJDB948001																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="346 619 1420 766"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 OCT 17</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 DEC 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 AUG 30</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="346 819 1420 892"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="346 945 1420 1113"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>56</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>76</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>60</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>16</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 OCT 17	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 DEC 15	(d) Date Design Complete	93 AUG 30	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	56	(b) All Other Design Costs	20	(c) Total	76	(d) Contract	60	(e) In-house	16
(a) Date Design Started	92 OCT 17																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 DEC 15																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 AUG 30																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	56																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	20																							
(c) Total	76																							
(d) Contract	60																							
(e) In-house	16																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)						2. DATE			
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION DYESS AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS				4. COMMAND AIR COMBAT COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX 0.92				
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	TOTAL
a. As of 30 SEP 92		765	4465	401							5,631
b. End FY 1998		752	4188	390							5,330
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (6,432)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)										218,829	
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:										16,770	
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:										10,390	
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)										6,200	
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:										21,050	
g. Remaining Deficiency:										0	
h. Grand Total:										273,239	
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE			SCOPE		COST (\$000)		DESIGN STATUS		
CODE									START		CML
121-122		UPGRADE HYDRANT FUELING SYSTEM, PHASE II			LS		9,500		AUG 92		JUL 93
872-247		WEAPONS STORAGE AREA SECURITY			11,300 LF		890		JUL 92		JUL 93
		TOTAL:					10,390				
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995)											
721-312		ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES			25,300 SF		5,200				
871-183		STORM DRAINAGE FACILITIES			LS		1,000				
		TOTAL:					6,200				
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
111-111		UPGRADE RUNWAY			LS		3,900				
211-111		HANGAR FIRE PROTECTION			LS		1,300				
211-153		ADD TO NONDESTRUCTIVE INSPECTION SHOP			LS		500				
724-417		VISITING OFFICERS QUARTERS			40,000 SF		4,600				
730-835		SECURITY POLICE OPERATIONS			9,000 SF		1,350				
10. Mission or Major Functions: A flying wing which includes two bomb squadrons (B-1 aircraft) one of which is responsible for training all B-1 aircrews, and one air refueling squadron (KC-135 aircraft); and an Air Mobility Command airlift wing which includes two C-130 squadrons.											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:										0	
b. Water pollution:										0	
c. Occupational safety and health:										0	
d. Other Environmental:										0	

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)				2. DATE		
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION DYESS AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS			4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE HYDRANT FUELING SYSTEM, PHASE II					
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 1.18.96C		6. CATEGORY CODE 121-122	7. PROJECT NUMBER FNWZ9230042		8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 9,500			
9. COST ESTIMATES								
ITEM					U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
UPGRADE HYDRANT FUELING SYSTEM, PHASE II								7,772
HYDRANT FUELING SYSTEM PITS					EA	20	75,000	(1,500)
RAMP SUPPLY AND RETURN PIPING					LF	10,600	53C	(5,618)
ISOLATION VALVE PITS					EA	8	39,880	(319)
INTERCONNECTION TO B-1B SYSTEM					LF	2,200	125	(275)
LEAK DETECTION SYSTEM					LF	7,500	8	(60)
SUPPORTING FACILITIES								763
SITE IMPROVEMENTS					LS			(560)
DEMOLITION					SY	4,000	50	(200)
SUBTOTAL								8,532
CONTINGENCY (5%)								427
TOTAL CONTRACT COST								8,959
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)								538
TOTAL REQUEST								9,497
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)								9,500
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Replace flight line fuel supply and return piping, refueling pits, and lateral control pits to complete construction of hydrant system project. Includes leak detection, 20 refueling pits, isolation valve pits, interconnection to existing type III system, and demolition and disposal of five Type II pumphouses with tanks. Project includes all necessary support.								
11. REQUIREMENT: As required. PROJECT: Upgrade hydrant fuel system Phase II. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: A hydrant refueling system with 20 refueling pits (one for each aircraft parking position) is required to support assigned aircraft. Force generation schedules for emergency war and contingency missions require a simultaneous refueling capability for five aircraft within one hour. This drives the requirement for a hydrant system rated at 3000 gallons per minute. This phase of the two-phase initiative will complete the hydrant system by providing flightline fuel supply and return piping with leak detection (as required for new systems by Texas law) plus refueling pits and lateral control pits. Phase I provided limited capabilities by constructing pumphouses, tanks, backup power, fillstands and connections to the bulk fuel receiving system. This project is phased due to construction timing which will require execution over a two-year period. CURRENT SITUATION: The existing hydrant refueling system, consisting of five pump houses, 30 underground operating tanks, and 55 refueling outlet pits was installed in 1957 to support B-47 and KC-97 aircraft. This system cannot provide the fuel flow rates necessary to meet the one-hour generation requirement for five KC-135 aircraft. The system is old and unreliable. Extensive maintenance and repairs are required just to keep								

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION DYESS AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS		
4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE HYDRANT FUELING SYSTEM, PHASE II	5. PROJECT NUMBER FNWZ9230042	
<p>this system operational due to its age and heavy use. Ground water has penetrated electrical conduits causing excessive corrosion of the electrical pump controls and necessitating costly repairs just to sustain minimal capability. Existing refueling pits are improperly spaced for the assigned aircraft, thus adjacent pits cannot be used at the same time. Of 55 existing refueling pits, only 20 are usable due to spacing problems, and 10 of these are only authorized for use by a MAJCOM waiver to safety distance criteria and hose length restrictions on the refueling equipment. These same 10 pits also require refueling the aircraft from the blind side, which involves extensive work-arounds to comply with safety procedures.</p> <p>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: The base will not be able to meet required force generation times to support emergency war order/readiness requirements. Safety waivers will continue to be required for refueling aircraft under conditions conducive to fuel spills and accidents which could jeopardize the health and safety of maintenance personnel, as well as place multimillion dollar aircraft at risk.</p> <p>ADDITIONAL: A preliminary analysis of reasonable options for accomplishing this project was done. It indicates there is only one option that satisfies statutory requirements. Because of this, a full economic analysis was not performed. A certificate of exclusion has been prepared. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements".</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION DYESS AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS																								
4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE HYDRANT FUELING SYSTEM, PHASE II	5. PROJECT NUMBER FNWZ9230042																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="388 666 1439 797"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 AUG 23</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 DEC 62</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 JUL 30</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="388 862 1345 928"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="388 982 1439 1146"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>200</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>42</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>242</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>200</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>42</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 AUG 23	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 DEC 62	(d) Date Design Complete	93 JUL 30	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	200	(b) All Other Design Costs	42	(c) Total	242	(d) Contract	200	(e) In-house	42
(a) Date Design Started	92 AUG 23																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 DEC 62																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 JUL 30																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	200																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	42																							
(c) Total	242																							
(d) Contract	200																							
(e) In-house	42																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)					2. DATE			
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION GOODFELLOW AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS			4. COMMAND AIR TRAINING COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX 0.89				
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT		STUDENTS		SUPPORTED		TOTAL		
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV			
a. As of 30 SEP 92		148	1255	317	219	562	19	12	861	3,393
b. End FY 1998		167	1145	384	170	438	1	12	861	3,178
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)										
a. Total Acreage: (1,139)										
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)		108,733								
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:		5,380								
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:		3,700								
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)		0								
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:		17,200								
g. Remaining Deficiency:		0								
h. Grand Total:		135,013								
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994										
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE		SCOPE		COST (\$000)		DESIGN STATUS		
<u>CODE</u>								<u>START</u>		<u>CMPL</u>
219-944		BASE ENGINEERING COMPLEX		44,900 SF		3,700		JUN 92		SEP 93
				TOTAL:		3,700				
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995) NONE										
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:										
442-758		LOGISTICS COMPLEX		91,000 SF		6,300				
442-769		FURNITURE MANAGEMENT AND SERVICES FACILITY		22,200 SF		1,100				
721-312		STUDENT DORMITORY		288 PN		6,800				
812-223		PRIMARY OVERHEAD DIST LINE		LS		3,000				
10. Mission or Major Functions: Training center for cryptology, intelligence, and linguistic training courses.										
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:										
a. Air pollution:		0								
b. Water pollution:		0								
c. Occupational safety and health:		0								
d. Other Environmental:		0								

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)		2. DATE	
AIR FORCE					
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION			4. PROJECT TITLE		
GOODFELLOW AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS			BASE ENGINEERING COMPLEX		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT	6. CATEGORY CODE	7. PROJECT NUMBER	8. PROJECT COST(\$000)		
8.57.96T	219-944	JCGU880901	3,700		
9. COST ESTIMATES					
ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
BASE ENGINEERING COMPLEX	SF	44,900		2,436	
MAINTENANCE SHOP	SF	9,600	79	(758)	
ENGINEERING MANAGEMENT	SF	13,300	69	(918)	
COVERED STORAGE FACILITY & SHED	SF	18,600	29	(539)	
PAVEMENTS & GROUNDS FACILITY	SF	3,400	65	(221)	
SUPPORTING FACILITIES				895	
UTILITIES/EMCS/COMMUNICATIONS	LS			(220)	
SITE IMPROVEMENT/PAVEMENTS	LS			(200)	
DEMOLITION	SF	56,500	4	(225)	
PREWIRED WORKSTATIONS	EA	60	4,167	(250)	
SUBTOTAL				3,331	
CONTINGENCY (5%)				167	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST				3,498	
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)				210	
TOTAL REQUEST				3,708	
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)				3,700	
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Reinforced concrete foundation and concrete floor slab, pre-engineered metal frame, and roof system. Includes pre-wired work stations, management/engineering space, storage, shops, drafting room, control room, demolition of 19 buildings, relocate two storage sheds, and all necessary support. Air Conditioning: 50 Tons.					
11. REQUIREMENT: 45,500 SF ADEQUATE: 640 SF SUBSTANDARD: 41,639 SF PROJECT: Construct a base engineering complex. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: A centralized Base Engineering facility, properly configured and sized to develop, program, and execute requirements to maintain, repair, operate and construct facilities, pavements and utility systems in support of the base mission. CURRENT SITUATION: The existing Base Civil Engineering function is housed, for the most part, in 23 facilities constructed in 1941 to support facility maintenance practices at that time. The management building has been extensively modified with various additions to the extent that today there are unusable spaces within the interior floor plan. Very poor office arrangements and most importantly, the roof system is made up of different coverings and many different slopes making leaks difficult to locate and nearly impossible to repair. These leaks have damaged very expensive equipment. The shop and storage buildings cannot support a modern facility maintenance activity. In addition, zonal maintenance and reorganization will render them even more useless and inefficient. Nineteen buildings totalling 56,500 SF will be demolished upon completion of this project. IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: Base engineering functions will remain decentralized in substandard energy inefficient facilities with continued					

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION GOODFELLOW AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS		
4. PROJECT TITLE BASE ENGINEERING COMPLEX	5. PROJECT NUMBER JCGU880901	
<p>safety and space problems. Civil engineering supplies and materials will deteriorate and become unusable due to constant exposure to the weather. ADDITIONAL: An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of new construction, revitalization and status quo operation. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, new construction was found to be the most cost efficient over the life of the project. This project meets the criteria/scope specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". Of the 23 existing buildings, 18 will be demolished, 2 relocated to new complex, and 3 converted to other missions. Other missions moving into converted buildings will vacate one building that will be demolished.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION GOODFELLOW AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS																								
4. PROJECT TITLE BASE ENGINEERING COMPLEX	5. PROJECT NUMBER JCGU880901																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="330 609 1404 745"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 JUN 10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 SEP 10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 SEP 15</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="330 798 1404 871"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>YES</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>LAUGHLIN</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="330 924 1404 1092"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>77</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>77</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>60</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>17</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 JAN</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 JUN 10	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 SEP 10	(d) Date Design Complete	93 SEP 15	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	YES	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	LAUGHLIN	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	77	(b) All Other Design Costs		(c) Total	77	(d) Contract	60	(e) In-house	17
(a) Date Design Started	92 JUN 10																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 SEP 10																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 SEP 15																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	YES																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	LAUGHLIN																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	77																							
(b) All Other Design Costs																								
(c) Total	77																							
(d) Contract	60																							
(e) In-house	17																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)						2. DATE			
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION KELLY AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS				4. COMMAND AIR FORCE MATERIEL COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX 0.88				
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	TOTAL
a. As of 30 SEP 92		875	3879	16243							20,997
b. End FY 1998		828	3771	14251							18,850
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (4,703)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)										450,289	
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:										60,290	
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:										27,481	
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)										21,750	
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:										48,090	
g. Remaining Deficiency:										0	
h. Grand Total:										607,900	
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE			SCOPE		COST (\$000)		DESIGN STATUS		
CODE									START Cmpl		
112-211		UPGRADE TAXIWAY			32,500 SY		3,550		MAY 92 NOV 93		
141-763		C-17 ENGINEERING TEST LABORATORY			19,000 SF		2,600		SEP 92 NOV 93		
211-153		C-17 ADAL NONDESTRUCTIVE INSPECTION FACILITY (DBOF)			73,800 SF		4,900		SEP 92 OCT 93		
217-712		C-17 ALTER DEPOT AVIONICS FACILITY (DBOF)			23,000 SF		731		SEP 92 OCT 93		
610-675		ALTER WEAPON SYSTEMS SUPPORT CENTER, PHASE II (DBOF)			130,000 SF		7,800		APR 91 JUN 93		
721-312		ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES (DBOF)			136 PN		2,000		OCT 92 JAN 94		
832-266		UPGRADE SANITARY SEWER MAINS, PHASE I			40,000 LF		3,000		SEP 92 OCT 93		
871-183		UPGRADE STORM DRAINAGE SYSTEM, PHASE I			3,600 LF		2,900		SEP 92 DEC 93		
							TOTAL:		27,481		
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995)											
121-122		ALTER HYDRANT FUELING SYSTEMS			LS		3,850				
211-152		C-17 COMPOSITE REPAIR FACILITY			55,000 SF		5,400				
211-157		C-17 ENGINE OVERHAUL FACILITY			65,000 SF		6,700				
721-312		ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES			136 PN		2,100				
730-772		ADD TO AND ALTER CHAPEL CENTER			3,600 SF		600				
832-266		UPGRADE SANITARY SEWER LINES			40,000 LF		3,100				
							TOTAL:		21,750		
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
141-453		BASE OPERATIONS			44,000 SF		4,400				
441-758		SUPPLIES & EQUIP WHSE DEPOT			13,000 SF		1,380				
610-675		BASE CONTRACTING FACILITY			23,900 SF		2,600				
730-835		SECURITY POLICE OPERATIONS			25,000 SF		2,400				
812-225		UPGRADE ELECTRIC DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM			LS		2,900				

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)									2. DATE								
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION KELLY AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS	4. COMMAND AIR FORCE MATERIEL COMMAND						5. AREA CONST COST INDEX 0.88											
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH	PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			TOTAL								
	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV									
a. As of																		
b. End FY																		
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)																		
a. Total Acreage: b. Inventory Total As Of: c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory: d. Authorization Requested In This Program: e. Authorization Included In Following Program: f. Planned In Next Four Program Years: g. Remaining Deficiency: h. Grand Total:																		
10. Mission or Major Functions: San Antonio Air Logistics Center which is responsible for logistics management, support, and depot-level maintenance of B-52, C-5, C-9, C-17, T-37, T-38, and T-41 aircraft, and all fuels and TF39/T56/F100 engines; an Air National Guard fighter group (F-16 squadron); an Air Force Reserve airlift wing (C-5 aircraft); Headquarters Air Force Intelligence Command; Air Force News Agency; Joint and Air Force Electronic Warfare Centers; Air Force Cryptological Applications Center; & an AF Intelligence Command intelligence wing.																		
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies: <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 80%;">a. Air pollution:</td> <td style="text-align: right;">12,500</td> </tr> <tr> <td>b. Water pollution:</td> <td style="text-align: right;">23,400</td> </tr> <tr> <td>c. Occupational safety and health:</td> <td style="text-align: right;">0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>d. Other Environmental:</td> <td style="text-align: right;">4,350</td> </tr> </table>											a. Air pollution:	12,500	b. Water pollution:	23,400	c. Occupational safety and health:	0	d. Other Environmental:	4,350
a. Air pollution:	12,500																	
b. Water pollution:	23,400																	
c. Occupational safety and health:	0																	
d. Other Environmental:	4,350																	

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION KELLY AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS			4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE TAXIWAY			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 7.28.96		6. CATEGORY CODE 112-211	7. PROJECT NUMBER MBPB953505	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 3,550		
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
UPGRADE TAXIWAY		LS			2,421	
REPAIR TAXIWAY		SY	32,500	73	(2,373)	
REPAIR PAVED SHOULDERS		LS			(48)	
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					635	
UTILITIES		LS			(50)	
DEMOLITION		LS			(585)	
SUBTOTAL					3,056	
CONTINGENCY (10%)					306	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					3,362	
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					202	
TOTAL REQUEST					3,564	
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					3,550	
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Remove and replace taxiway pavement with medium load concrete on stabilized aggregate base; repair or replace asphalt shoulders and lighting as necessary, including pavement marking and necessary support.						
11. REQUIREMENT: 936,600 SY ADEQUATE: 904,100 SY SUBSTANDARD: 32,500 SY <u>PROJECT:</u> Upgrade taxiway. (Current Mission) <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> A taxiway, in good repair, is required for ground movement of aircraft between parking aprons and the south end of the primary runway and to the hazardous cargo loading area. Access to the hazardous cargo area is especially important as Kelly Air Force Base is one of two collection and distribution points for standard munitions and equipment packages, referred to as Standard Air Munitions Packages (STAMP) and Standard Tanks, Racks, Adapters and Pylon Packages (STRAPP) that support combat units in contingency situations. The taxiway is also needed by operational C-5A and fighter aircraft for runway access. <u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> The existing taxiway consists of an asphalt overlay of a 50 year old deteriorated concrete base. A January 1990 pavement evaluation report by the Air Force Civil Engineering Center shows this taxiway as serviceable with load limitations. It recommends restricting the lighter aircraft using the pavement to 50 percent payload reduction. Heavier aircraft will have to reduce payload by 70 percent. Heavier traffic experienced during "Just Cause" and "Desert Storm" has further damaged the subbase to the point where pavement failure is possible even under reduced loads. <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> The taxiway pavement is likely to fail within two to five years, which would require longer taxi distances for aircraft						

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION KELLY AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS		
4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE TAXIWAY	5. PROJECT NUMBER MBPB953505	
<p>using the east ramp and would make the hazardous cargo pad inaccessible. Loading of munitions in support of operations such as "Desert Storm" would be hampered or would have to be accomplished in unsafe areas placing many lives at risk.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> All known alternative options were considered during the development of this project. No other option could meet the mission requirements; therefore, a full economic analysis was not needed or performed. A certificate of exemption has been prepared. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements".</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION KELLY AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS																								
4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE TAXIWAY	5. PROJECT NUMBER MBPB953505																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="360 625 1410 758"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 MAY 21</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>40%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 AUG 10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 SEP 30</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="360 821 1328 884"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="360 947 1410 1104"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>97</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>110</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>207</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>76</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>131</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 MAY 21	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	40%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 AUG 10	(d) Date Design Complete	93 SEP 30	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	97	(b) All Other Design Costs	110	(c) Total	207	(d) Contract	76	(e) In-house	131
(a) Date Design Started	92 MAY 21																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	40%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 AUG 10																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 SEP 30																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	97																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	110																							
(c) Total	207																							
(d) Contract	76																							
(e) In-house	131																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE			
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION KELLY AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS				4. PROJECT TITLE C-17 ENGINEERING TEST LABORATORY				
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 4.11.30L		6. CATEGORY CODE 141-763	7. PROJECT NUMBER MBPB923003		8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 2,600			
9. COST ESTIMATES								
ITEM					U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
C-17 ENGINEERING TEST LABORATORY					SF	19,000	90	1,710
SUPPORTING FACILITIES								635
UTILITIES					LS			(180)
PAVEMENTS					LS			(70)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS					LS			(315)
COMMUNICATIONS SUPPORT					LS			(30)
PRE-WIRED WORK STATIONS					EA	12	3,333	(40)
SUBTOTAL								2,345
CONTINGENCY (5%)								117
TOTAL CONTRACT COST								2,462
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)								148
TOTAL REQUEST								2,610
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)								2,600
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Environmentally controlled building with reinforced concrete foundation and floor slab, steel frame, masonry walls and roof system; pre-wired work stations, site clearance, utilities, pavements and necessary support. Air Conditioning: 70 Tons.								
11. REQUIREMENT: 30,015 SF ADEQUATE: 11,015 SF SUBSTANDARD: 0 PROJECT: Construct a C-17 engineering test laboratory. (New Mission) REQUIREMENT: An environmentally controlled facility is required for investigation of mishaps to life support equipment and engineering laboratory testing of primary C-17 aircraft components. Specifically, it is used to provide data for analysis of mishaps, to develop prototype engineering solutions to service revealed design deficiencies, develop nondestructive inspection procedures, gather engineering data from flight tests, resolve electronic component anomalies, verify contractor products and investigate corrosion and composite material problems. In addition to supporting C-17 requirements, the facility could be used to provide the same services for other weapon systems. CURRENT SITUATION: No existing facility at Kelly Air Force Base can adequately house the engineering test support required for the C-17. Engineering test functions are performed on a smaller scale in laboratory space in three separate buildings. One is shared with other functions with no space for expansion, while the other two do not meet the environmental or space criteria required to perform the C-17 engineering test workload. Continued use or expansion of these facilities is not feasible. IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: C-17 engineering test workload will have to be accomplished by contract, resulting in significantly increased costs and								

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION KELLY AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS		
4. PROJECT TITLE C-17 ENGINEERING TEST LABORATORY	5. PROJECT NUMBER MBPB923003	
<p>program delays. It will also adversely impact the ability to resolve service revealed deficiencies and to undertake timely and effective engineering action to enhance system reliability and maintainability.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of new construction, revitalization, leasing and status quo operation. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, new construction was found to be the most cost efficient over the life of the project. There is no criteria/scope for this project in either Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide" or in AFM 86-2.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																																													
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION KELLY AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS																																															
4. PROJECT TITLE C-17 ENGINEERING TEST LABORATORY	5. PROJECT NUMBER MBPB923003																																														
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td colspan="3">(1) Status:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td></td> <td>92 SEP 25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td></td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td></td> <td>92 DEC 05</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td></td> <td>93 SEP 30</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(2) Basis:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td></td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td></td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td></td> <td>140</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td></td> <td>52</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td></td> <td>192</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> <td>140</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td></td> <td>52</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(4) Construction Start</td> <td></td> <td>93 DEC</td> </tr> </table> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(1) Status:			(a) Date Design Started		92 SEP 25	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%	(c) Date 35% Designed		92 DEC 05	(d) Date Design Complete		93 SEP 30	(2) Basis:			(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A	(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)			(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		140	(b) All Other Design Costs		52	(c) Total		192	(d) Contract		140	(e) In-house		52	(4) Construction Start		93 DEC
(1) Status:																																															
(a) Date Design Started		92 SEP 25																																													
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%																																													
(c) Date 35% Designed		92 DEC 05																																													
(d) Date Design Complete		93 SEP 30																																													
(2) Basis:																																															
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO																																													
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A																																													
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)																																															
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		140																																													
(b) All Other Design Costs		52																																													
(c) Total		192																																													
(d) Contract		140																																													
(e) In-house		52																																													
(4) Construction Start		93 DEC																																													

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION KELLY AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS			4. PROJECT TITLE C-17 ADAL NONDESTRUCTIVE INSPECTION FACILITY (DBOF)			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 4.11.30L	6. CATEGORY CODE 211-153	7. PROJECT NUMBER MBPB943007	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 4,900			
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
C-17 ADAL NONDESTRUCTIVE INSPECTION FACILITY (DBOF)		SF	74,000		4,036	
ALTERATION		SF	57,000	38	(2,166)	
ADDITION		SF	17,000	110	(1,870)	
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					170	
UTILITIES		LS			(120)	
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(50)	
SUBTOTAL					4,206	
CONTINGENCY (10%)					421	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					4,627	
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					278	
TOTAL REQUEST					4,905	
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					4,900	
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Addition includes concrete foundation and floor slab, metal walls and roof, relocation of hangar doors with new doors in the center section. Alteration includes upgrade of drainage and fire suppression systems, replacement of lighting and HVAC equipment, painting and necessary support.						
11. REQUIREMENT: 87,750 SF ADEQUATE: 13,750 SF SUBSTANDARD: 57,000 SF PROJECT: Add to and alter a C-17 nondestructive inspection (NDI) facility. (New Mission) <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> A properly sized and configured facility is required in which to perform nondestructive inspections on C-17 aircraft prior to the onset of depot maintenance operations at this base. The facility must be large enough to house the entire aircraft and must have adequate utilities and fire protection. An addition to the existing hangar is needed to enclose the C-17 empennage section and revitalization of the utilities is needed to ensure efficient and reliable inspections. <u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> The existing facility was constructed in 1942 as an aircraft maintenance hangar. While the building is structurally sound, it is neither large enough nor high enough to enclose the C-17 tail section. Additionally, the heating and ventilation systems are marginal, while the industrial waste drains, lighting, hoists and fire protection system are inadequate for nondestructive inspection activities. <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Deferral of inspection workloads until space becomes available in the maintenance hangar, which will upset depot maintenance schedules and delay return of the aircraft to the using organization. <u>ADDITIONAL:</u> The requirement for this project was validated by the Joint Service Depot Maintenance Industrial Military Construction Review Panel in						

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION KELLY AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS		
4. PROJECT TITLE C-17 ADAL NONDESTRUCTIVE INSPECTION FACILITY (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER MBPB943007	
<p>May 1990. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements". An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of new construction, revitalization, contracting and status quo operation. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternative, revitalization was found to be the most cost effective over the life of the project.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																																													
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION KELLY AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS																																															
4. PROJECT TITLE C-17 ADAL NONDESTRUCTIVE INSPECTION FACILITY (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER MBPB943007																																														
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td colspan="3">(1) Status:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td></td> <td>92 SEP 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td></td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td></td> <td>92 DEC 05</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td></td> <td>93 OCT 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(2) Basis:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td></td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td></td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td></td> <td>275</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td></td> <td>117</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td></td> <td>392</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> <td>275</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td></td> <td>117</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(4) Construction Start</td> <td></td> <td>93 DEC</td> </tr> </table> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(1) Status:			(a) Date Design Started		92 SEP 15	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%	(c) Date 35% Designed		92 DEC 05	(d) Date Design Complete		93 OCT 01	(2) Basis:			(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A	(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)			(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		275	(b) All Other Design Costs		117	(c) Total		392	(d) Contract		275	(e) In-house		117	(4) Construction Start		93 DEC
(1) Status:																																															
(a) Date Design Started		92 SEP 15																																													
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%																																													
(c) Date 35% Designed		92 DEC 05																																													
(d) Date Design Complete		93 OCT 01																																													
(2) Basis:																																															
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO																																													
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A																																													
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)																																															
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		275																																													
(b) All Other Design Costs		117																																													
(c) Total		392																																													
(d) Contract		275																																													
(e) In-house		117																																													
(4) Construction Start		93 DEC																																													

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)				2. DATE		
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION KELLY AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS				4. PROJECT TITLE ALTER WEAPON SYSTEMS SUPPORT CENTER, PHASE II (DBOF)				
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 7.28.96		6. CATEGORY CODE 610-675	7. PROJECT NUMBER MBPB943012		8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 7,800			
9. COST ESTIMATES								
ITEM					U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
ALTER WEAPON SYSTEMS SUPPORT CENTER, PHASE II (DBOF)					LS			5,770
INTERIOR ALTERATIONS					SF	130,000	29	(3,770)
EXTERIOR UPGRADE					LS			(2,000)
SUPPORTING FACILITIES								905
UTILITIES					LS			(200)
PAVEMENTS					SY	10,500	29	(305)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS					LS			(109)
DEMOLITION					LS			(300)
SUBTOTAL								6,675
CONTINGENCY (10%)								668
TOTAL CONTRACT COST								7,343
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)								441
TOTAL REQUEST								7,784
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)								7,800
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Interior alterations include new suspended ceiling and lighting, fire detection and suppression system, carpet, wall covering, asbestos removal, window/door replacement, HVAC and electrical system upgrade. Exterior work includes window and entrance improvements, painting, site clean-up and necessary support. Air Conditioning: 30 Tons.								
11. REQUIREMENT: 1,050,000 SF ADEQUATE: 729,600 SF SUBSTANDARD: 607,500 SF PROJECT: Alter a weapon systems support center. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: A facility of adequate size and configuration with proper environmental controls is needed to assure timely and efficient logistical support to the managed weapons systems. Significant economies will result from collocation of logistics functions, directed by Defense Management Review (DMR) actions. These involve the acquisition, modification, repair and distribution of aircraft, engines and spare parts. Space savings envisioned in this project will make such a collocation possible without added floor space. This final phase will allow consolidation of material management functions currently located in remote buildings. Required improvements include installation of energy efficient doors, windows, lighting, and air conditioning, and replacement of worn out floor covering and asbestos ceilings. CURRENT SITUATION: Core logistic functions are fragmented in five inadequate facilities separated by up to 1.5 miles. This fragmentation adversely impacts productivity and increases logistics response and pipeline times. The majority of the logistics professionals have been cramped into the inadequate Weapon Systems Support Center, which was constructed in 1942 as a warehouse and later converted to an administrative facility.								

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION KELLY AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS		
4. PROJECT TITLE ALTER WEAPON SYSTEMS SUPPORT CENTER, PHASE II (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER MBPB943012	
<p>Projected force reductions resulting from the DMR, now make it possible to house all core logistics functions in the same building, if the floor plan is revised and building deficiencies corrected to accommodate long-term use. Building deficiencies include an unsafe electrical system (Risk Assessment Code 2 has been assigned), inadequate air conditioning, asbestos insulation and ceiling tiles, rotted window frames, and worn out exterior doors. The facility consumes energy at a rate 25% higher than a new or upgraded facility. Consolidation of functions will not only improve productivity, but will permit the demolition of about 28,000 square feet of substandard facilities upon completion of this project.</p> <p>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: Continued fragmentation of core logistics personnel and processes will significantly degrade logistics support to other major commands and friendly foreign nations, weakening their combat readiness posture. It will also increase DOD logistical support costs, waste energy, and defeat zero overpricing initiatives.</p> <p>ADDITIONAL: An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of new construction, revitalization, leasing, private sector financing and status quo operation. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, revitalization was found to be the most cost efficient over the life of the project. This project meets the criteria/scope specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide".</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION KELLY AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS																								
4. PROJECT TITLE ALTER WEAPON SYSTEMS SUPPORT CENTER, PHASE II (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER MBPB943012																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="330 609 1409 756"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>91 APR 12</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>91 JUN 20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 JUN 30</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="330 798 1409 882"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="330 924 1409 1102"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>310</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>216</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>526</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>310</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>216</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	91 APR 12	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	50%	(c) Date 35% Designed	91 JUN 20	(d) Date Design Complete	93 JUN 30	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	310	(b) All Other Design Costs	216	(c) Total	526	(d) Contract	310	(e) In-house	216
(a) Date Design Started	91 APR 12																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	50%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	91 JUN 20																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 JUN 30																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	310																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	216																							
(c) Total	526																							
(d) Contract	310																							
(e) In-house	216																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION KELLY AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS		4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES (DBOF)		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 7.28.96	6. CATEGORY CODE 721-312	7. PROJECT NUMBER MBPB867337	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 2,000	
9. COST ESTIMATES				
ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES (DBOF)	SF	28,650		1,500
ADDITION	SF	3,350	70	(235)
ALTERATIONS	SF	25,300	50	(1,265)
SUPPORTING FACILITIES		1		200
PAVEMENTS	LS			(125)
COMMUNICATIONS SUPPORT	LS			(25)
UTILITIES	LS			(25)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS	LS			(25)
SUBTOTAL				1,700
CONTINGENCY (10%)				170
TOTAL CONTRACT COST				1,870
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)				112
TOTAL REQUEST				1,982
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)				2,000
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Remodel interior partitioning to provide room-bathroom modules, exterior entrances and balconies; extend roofline and upgrade exterior; install cable TV system, upgrade laundry rooms and HVAC systems and provide necessary support. Grade Mix: 272 E1-E4.				
11. REQUIREMENT: 1,357 PN ADEQUATE: 1,085 PN SUBSTANDARD: 272 PN PROJECT: Add to and alter dormitories. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: A major Air Force objective is to provide unaccompanied enlisted personnel with housing that is conducive to their proper rest, relaxation, and personal well-being. Properly designed and furnished quarters, which provide some degree of individual privacy, are essential to the successful accomplishment of the increasingly complicated jobs these people must perform. CURRENT SITUATION: The buildings to be upgraded were constructed in the early 1950s with community latrines on each floor, and are deficient in living space, privacy, sound attenuation, convenience outlets, lighting, and insulation. Many occupants are shift workers who find that the traffic in the corridors make daytime sleep difficult or impossible. This is the fourth phase of a five-phased program. IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: Substandard on-base living conditions will continue to degrade the morale, productivity and career satisfaction of the enlisted force. ADDITIONAL: This project meets the criteria/scope specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of new construction and revitalization. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, revitalization was found to be the most cost				

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION KELLY AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS		
4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER MBPB867337	
<p>efficient over the life of the project.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																																													
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION KELLY AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS																																															
4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER MBPB867337																																														
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td colspan="3">(1) Status:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td></td> <td>92 OCT 17</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td></td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td></td> <td>92 DEC 30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td></td> <td>94 JAN 20</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(2) Basis:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td></td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td></td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td></td> <td>120</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td></td> <td>200</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td></td> <td>320</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> <td>290</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td></td> <td>30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(4) Construction Start</td> <td></td> <td>94 MAR</td> </tr> </table> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(1) Status:			(a) Date Design Started		92 OCT 17	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%	(c) Date 35% Designed		92 DEC 30	(d) Date Design Complete		94 JAN 20	(2) Basis:			(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A	(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)			(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		120	(b) All Other Design Costs		200	(c) Total		320	(d) Contract		290	(e) In-house		30	(4) Construction Start		94 MAR
(1) Status:																																															
(a) Date Design Started		92 OCT 17																																													
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%																																													
(c) Date 35% Designed		92 DEC 30																																													
(d) Date Design Complete		94 JAN 20																																													
(2) Basis:																																															
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO																																													
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A																																													
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)																																															
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		120																																													
(b) All Other Design Costs		200																																													
(c) Total		320																																													
(d) Contract		290																																													
(e) In-house		30																																													
(4) Construction Start		94 MAR																																													

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION KELLY AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS			4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE SANITARY SEWER MAINS, PHASE I			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 7.80.56		6. CATEGORY CODE 832-266	7. PROJECT NUMBER MBPB943804	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 3,000		
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
UPGRADE SANITARY SEWER MAINS, PHASE I		LF	40,000	50	2,000	
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					590	
MANHOLES		EA	150	1,600	(240)	
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(350)	
SUBTOTAL					2,590	
CONTINGENCY (10%)					259	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					2,849	
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					171	
TOTAL REQUEST					3,020	
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					3,000	
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Excavate and replace sanitary sewer lines with PVC pipe, bedded and backfilled; repair pavements and restore site. Abandon existing lines in place where possible.						
11. REQUIREMENT: As required. <u>PROJECT:</u> Upgrade sanitary sewer mains, phase 1 of 3. (Current Mission) <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> This is a Level I environmental compliance project. A sanitary sewage collection system in good working order is required to convey wastes from a base population of over 20,000, housed in more than 500 buildings, to a connection point with the City of San Antonio for treatment. The system must not discharge untreated sewage into local aquifers consistent with a Texas Water Commission (TWC) compliance order dated 4 May 1989. This order requires repair of all leaking underground collection systems by July 1995. This is the first phase of a three phased effort to upgrade sanitary sewage mains at this base. <u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> Most of the base sewer lines are over 40 years old and made of brittle vitrified clay which is susceptible to cracking and breaking by shifting soils. Emergency repairs to the system are often necessary as the lines are badly deteriorated. This condition was confirmed by a recent inspection using television cameras inside the lines. This inspection found 20 percent of the 200,000 feet of sewer lines needed replacement, with some sections completely disintegrated. Cross connections exist between industrial waste and sanitary sewer lines, leaving the potential of contaminating the sanitary sewage in violation of state and federal EPA regulations. <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Contamination of soil and aquifers will continue in violation of federal and state EPA regulations. High cleanup costs as well as fines and lawsuits are likely.						

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION KELLY AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS		
4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE SANITARY SEWER MAINS, PHASE I	5. PROJECT NUMBER MBPB943804	
<p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide", or in AFM 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements". All known alternative options were considered during the development of this project. No other option could meet the regulatory requirements; therefore, no economic analysis was needed or performed. A certificate of exemption has been prepared. This project complements the FY93 MILCON project to upgrade the industrial wastewater collection system and is not redundant.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION KELLY AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS																								
4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE SANITARY SEWER MAINS, PHASE I	5. PROJECT NUMBER MBPB943804																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="346 619 1409 766"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 SEP 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 DEC 05</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 OCT 01</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="346 819 1409 892"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="346 945 1409 1113"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>186</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>93</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>279</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>279</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 SEP 15	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 DEC 05	(d) Date Design Complete	93 OCT 01	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	186	(b) All Other Design Costs	93	(c) Total	279	(d) Contract		(e) In-house	279
(a) Date Design Started	92 SEP 15																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 DEC 05																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 OCT 01																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	186																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	93																							
(c) Total	279																							
(d) Contract																								
(e) In-house	279																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION KELLY AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS			4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE STORM DRAINAGE SYSTEM, PHASE I			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 7.80.56	6. CATEGORY CODE 871-183	7. PROJECT NUMBER MBPB953003	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 2,900			
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
UPGRADE STORM DRAINAGE SYSTEM, PHASE I		LF	3,600	210	756	
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					1,735	
UTILITIES		LS			(95)	
OTHER SUPPORTING FACILITIES		LS			(1,640)	
SUBTOTAL					2,491	
CONTINGENCY (10%)					249	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					2,740	
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					164	
TOTAL REQUEST					2,904	
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					2,900	
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Replace existing storm sewer with 84 inch reinforced concrete pipe; remove contaminated soil as necessary; provide lift station, precast manholes, and necessary support.						
11. REQUIREMENT: As required. PROJECT: Upgrade storm drainage system, phase 1 of 2. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: This is a Level II environmental compliance project. An adequate storm water runoff control system is required to prevent contamination of nearby streams and surface waters. Adequate detention/retention basins, stabilized ditches, fuel-water separators and elimination of cross-connections are needed to ensure heavy runoff cannot mix with oil and other contaminants associated with industrial activities, resulting in contamination of nearby streams. The volume and velocity of the runoff flow must be reduced in order to reduce the impact of heavy flows and allow contaminants to settle out before reaching off-base streams. Control of runoff from industrial areas is required by the Clean Water Act regulation (40 CFR 122.26). This is the first phase of a two phased effort to improve storm water control measures at this base. CURRENT SITUATION: The capacity of the existing drainage system is substantially inadequate and cannot accommodate the water runoff generated from approximately 30 thunderstorms per year, to comply with a November 4, 1989 Texas Water Commission compliance order, which requires all leaking collection systems to be repaired by July 1995. The surface runoff has been increasing in past years with the construction of additional buildings and parking lots. Meanwhile, inadequate drainage capacity and lack of retention/detention basins in the base storm drainage system have contributed to on-base flooding and possible contamination of off-base streams. Flooding problems have been experienced in such areas as the						

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION KELLY AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS		
4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE STORM DRAINAGE SYSTEM, PHASE I	5. PROJECT NUMBER MBPB953003	
<p>flight line, fuel storage and materials storage areas. Flooding has frequently resulted in production downtime. One recent flood caused the loss of 5,000 manhours.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Uncontrolled runoff will result in the inability of the base to meet discharge limits during heavy rains. Also, continued flooding will adversely affect mission essential operations, increase potential health and safety hazards to base personnel, and increase surface water contamination.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements".</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION KELLY AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS																								
4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE STORM DRAINAGE SYSTEM, PHASE I	5. PROJECT NUMBER MBPB953003																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 SEP 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 DEC 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 DEC 01</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>150</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>171</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>321</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>163</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>158</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 MAR</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 SEP 15	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 DEC 15	(d) Date Design Complete	93 DEC 01	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	150	(b) All Other Design Costs	171	(c) Total	321	(d) Contract	163	(e) In-house	158
(a) Date Design Started	92 SEP 15																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 DEC 15																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 DEC 01																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	150																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	171																							
(c) Total	321																							
(d) Contract	163																							
(e) In-house	158																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)						2. DATE			
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION LACKLAND AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS						4. COMMAND AIR TRAINING COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX 0.88		
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			TOTAL
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	
a. As of 30 SEP 92		1665	4111	2519	82	7086	93	11	372		15,939
b. End FY 1998		1706	4337	2747	298	5052	5	14	756	2	14,917
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (2,705)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)		346,839									
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:		66,900									
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:		30,093									
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)		14,600									
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:		8,744									
g. Remaining Deficiency:		0									
h. Grand Total:		467,176									
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE		SCOPE		COST (\$000)		DESIGN STATUS			
CODE								START		CMPL	
171-617		TRAINING SERVICES FACILITIES		38,050 SF		5,800		JUN 92		SEP 93	
610-243		ALTER BASE SUPPORT FACILITY		98,500 SF		5,400		JUN 92		SEP 93	
610-281		BASE CONTRACTING CENTER		17,300 SF		2,450		JUN 92		NOV 93	
610-281		MISSION SUPPORT CENTER		60,000 SF		7,543		JUN 90		SEP 93	
721-315		7-LEVEL TRAINING DORMITORY		90,500 SF		8,900		OCT 92		DEC 93	
				TOTAL:		30,093					
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995)											
171-476		COMBAT ARMS TRAINING FACILITY		37,300 SF		4,200					
171-621		7-LEVEL TRAINING CLASSROOMS		12,000 SF		2,000					
610-249		ALTER TECHNICAL TRAINING GROUP SUPPORT COMPLEX		62,500 SF		5,000					
721-312		ALTER RECRUIT DORMITORY		1,000 PN		3,400					
				TOTAL:		14,600					
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
130-835		SECURITY POLICE OPERATIONS FACILITY		15,450 SF		1,850					
131-111		ADD TO AND ALTER COMMUNICATIONS FACILITY		13,000 SF		2,000					
141-456		AFSS OPERATIONS		18,000 SF		3,244					
171-621		DETECTOR DOG TRAINING CLASSROOM		19,300 SF		1,650					
10. Mission or Major Functions: Air Force Military Training Center which includes Basic Military Training School, Officer Training School, and security police, cryptographic maintenance, recruiting, and social actions courses; Defense Language Institute English Language Center; DoD Military Working Dog Training Agency; and a major Air Force medical center.											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:		0									
b. Water pollution:		0									
c. Occupational safety and health:		0									
d. Other Environmental:		0									

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE			
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION LACKLAND AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS				4. PROJECT TITLE TRAINING SERVICES FACILITIES				
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 8.57.96T		6. CATEGORY CODE 171-617	7. PROJECT NUMBER MPLS909083		8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 5,800			
9. COST ESTIMATES								
ITEM					U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
TRAINING SERVICES FACILITY					SF	38,050		3,790
TRAINING AIDS SHOP					SF	25,400	85	(2,159)
AUDIO-VISUAL FACILITY					SF	10,100	140	(1,414)
TRAINING SERVICES MANAGEMENT					SF	2,550	85	(217)
SUPPORTING FACILITIES								1,420
DEMOLITION					SF	42,500	7	(300)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS					LS			(75)
UTILITIES/COMMUNICATIONS SUPPORT					LS			(640)
PAVEMENTS					LS			(370)
PREWIRED WORKSTATIONS					EA	12	2,917	(35)
SUBTOTAL								5,210
CONTINGENCY (5%)								261
TOTAL CONTRACT COST								5,471
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)								328
TOTAL REQUEST								5,799
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)								5,800
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Concrete foundation and floor slab, masonry walls, structural frame and standing seam metal roof system. Includes pre-wired workstations, maintenance shop, base graphics, film library, base photolaboratory, demolition of 8 buildings and other necessary support. Air Conditioning: 34 Tons.								
11. REQUIREMENT: 38,050 SF ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 39,152 SF PROJECT: Construct training and audiovisual services facilities. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: Adequate industrial shop type facilities are required to modify and maintain realistic training aids as required for tenant and Air Training Command missions. Audiovisual facilities are required to provide the very high demand graphic arts, audiovisual, and photo laborator support for the technical training mission. CURRENT SITUATION: Training services completes 80 orders/month in support of 56 different organizations with a month backlog on orders. The training services function currently occupies eight separate buildings in two areas of the base. Seven of these buildings are 40 to 50 years old and are deteriorated due to age and major termite damage. Paint spray and equipment manufacturing areas are grossly inadequate. The audiovisual function is housed in an old dining hall which has deteriorated structural, mechanical, and electrical systems and unsuitable ventilation. The entire training services function is in facilities that are deteriorated, cramped, and poorly configured with obsolete utility systems that contribute to health and safety deficiencies. Eight buildings totalling 42,460 SF will be disposed of upon completion of this project. IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: The training services function will continue to								

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION LACKLAND AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS		
4. PROJECT TITLE TRAINING SERVICES FACILITIES	5. PROJECT NUMBER MPLS909083	
<p>operate at reduced efficiency or under unsafe conditions due to space limitations and dilapidated conditions greatly impacting the effectiveness of its support of the training mission. Audiovisual will remain in a totally inadequate facility well past its time for demolition. Energy and maintenance cost will continue to escalate.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of new construction, revitalization, leasing and status quo operation. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, new construction was found to be the most cost efficient over the life of the project. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements".</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																																													
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION LACKLAND AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS																																															
4. PROJECT TITLE TRAINING SERVICES FACILITIES	5. PROJECT NUMBER MPLS909083																																														
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <table data-bbox="280 588 1409 1176"> <tr> <td colspan="3">(1) Status:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td></td> <td>92 JUN 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td></td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td></td> <td>92 SEP 30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td></td> <td>93 SEP 30</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(2) Basis:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td></td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td></td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td></td> <td>345</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td></td> <td>191</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td></td> <td>536</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> <td>350</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td></td> <td>186</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(4) Construction Start</td> <td></td> <td>93 DEC</td> </tr> </table> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(1) Status:			(a) Date Design Started		92 JUN 15	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%	(c) Date 35% Designed		92 SEP 30	(d) Date Design Complete		93 SEP 30	(2) Basis:			(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A	(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)			(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		345	(b) All Other Design Costs		191	(c) Total		536	(d) Contract		350	(e) In-house		186	(4) Construction Start		93 DEC
(1) Status:																																															
(a) Date Design Started		92 JUN 15																																													
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%																																													
(c) Date 35% Designed		92 SEP 30																																													
(d) Date Design Complete		93 SEP 30																																													
(2) Basis:																																															
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO																																													
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A																																													
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)																																															
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		345																																													
(b) All Other Design Costs		191																																													
(c) Total		536																																													
(d) Contract		350																																													
(e) In-house		186																																													
(4) Construction Start		93 DEC																																													

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION LACKLAND AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS			4. PROJECT TITLE ALTER BASE SUPPORT FACILITY			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 8.57.96T		6. CATEGORY CODE 610-243	7. PROJECT NUMBER MPLS943216	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 5,400		
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM					U/M	QUANTITY
ALTER BASE SUPPORT FACILITY					SF	98,500
SUPPORTING FACILITIES						29
UTILITIES					LS	(50)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS					LS	(50)
PAVEMENTS					LS	(100)
ELEVATOR					LS	(185)
PREWIRED WORKSTATIONS					EA	90
DEMOLITION AND ASBESTOS REMOVAL					SF	101,000
COMMUNICATION SUPPORT/EMCS					LS	(340)
SUBTOTAL						4,622
CONTINGENCY (10%)						462
TOTAL CONTRACT COST						5,084
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)						305
TOTAL REQUEST						5,389
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)						5,400
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Alter vacant 600 PN dormitory to provide administration, classroom, storage, and computer room. Includes interior partitions, electrical and mechanical upgrade, Energy Management and Control System (EMCS) points, communications support, handicapped elevator, demolition of 11 vacated facilities and other associated work. Air Conditioning: 350 Tons.						
11. REQUIREMENT: 138,618 SF ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 87,617 SF PROJECT: Alter 600 PN dormitory to house numerous base support functions. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: An adequate, energy efficient, properly configured facility is required to allow numerous base support activities scattered throughout Lackland to vacate substandard facilities and consolidate into one facility. This facility will provide space for Food Service Contractor, Civilian Personnel, Airman Leadership School, 3541st Recruiting Squadron, CATO, 8050 Military Training Squadron, Education Center, Food Service Offices, 801st Battalion and 8th Group Military Police, Corps of Engineers Project Office and Honor Guard. CURRENT SITUATION: Support functions are currently located in eleven wood frame buildings totalling 101,000 SF, which will be demolished upon completion of this project. These buildings have far exceeded their life expectancy, are structurally unsound, energy inefficient, and lack adequate electrical, mechanical and fire protection systems. The facilities are generally inadequate in configuration and their age and condition make them uneconomical to upgrade. Final beddown will consolidate all personnel into one building with five buildings reverting to other base functions.						

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION LACKLAND AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS		
4. PROJECT TITLE ALTER BASE SUPPORT FACILITY	5. PROJECT NUMBER MPLS943216	
<p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Continued use of energy inefficient facilities causing personnel to work in substandard, cramped, and deplorable facilities. A savings in energy and maintenance cost will not be realized.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of new construction, revitalization, leasing and status quo operation. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, revitalization was found to be the most cost efficient over the life of the project. This project meets the criteria/scope specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide".</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																																													
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION LACKLAND AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS																																															
4. PROJECT TITLE ALTER BASE SUPPORT FACILITY	5. PROJECT NUMBER MPLS943216																																														
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td colspan="3">(1) Status:</td> </tr> <tr> <td> (a) Date Design Started</td> <td></td> <td>92 JUN 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td> (b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td></td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td> (c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td></td> <td>92 SEP 30</td> </tr> <tr> <td> (d) Date Design Complete</td> <td></td> <td>93 SEP 30</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(2) Basis:</td> </tr> <tr> <td> (a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td></td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td> (b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td></td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</td> </tr> <tr> <td> (a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td></td> <td>336</td> </tr> <tr> <td> (b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td></td> <td>109</td> </tr> <tr> <td> (c) Total</td> <td></td> <td>445</td> </tr> <tr> <td> (d) Contract</td> <td></td> <td>301</td> </tr> <tr> <td> (e) In-house</td> <td></td> <td>144</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(4) Construction Start</td> <td></td> <td>93 DEC</td> </tr> </table> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(1) Status:			(a) Date Design Started		92 JUN 15	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%	(c) Date 35% Designed		92 SEP 30	(d) Date Design Complete		93 SEP 30	(2) Basis:			(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A	(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)			(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		336	(b) All Other Design Costs		109	(c) Total		445	(d) Contract		301	(e) In-house		144	(4) Construction Start		93 DEC
(1) Status:																																															
(a) Date Design Started		92 JUN 15																																													
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%																																													
(c) Date 35% Designed		92 SEP 30																																													
(d) Date Design Complete		93 SEP 30																																													
(2) Basis:																																															
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO																																													
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A																																													
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)																																															
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		336																																													
(b) All Other Design Costs		109																																													
(c) Total		445																																													
(d) Contract		301																																													
(e) In-house		144																																													
(4) Construction Start		93 DEC																																													

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)				2. DATE		
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION LACKLAND AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS				4. PROJECT TITLE MISSION SUPPORT CENTER				
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 8.57.96T		6. CATEGORY CODE 610-281	7. PROJECT NUMBER MPLS889006		8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 7,543			
9. COST ESTIMATES								
ITEM					U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
MISSION SUPPORT CENTER					SF	60,000	82	4,920
SUPPORTING FACILITIES								1,870
DEMOLITION/ASBESTOS REMOVAL					SF	97,500	6	(585)
COMMUNICATIONS SUPPORT					LS			(160)
UTILITIES					LS			(245)
PAVEMENTS					LS			(125)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS					LS			(85)
PREWIRED WORKSTATIONS					EA	214	2,570	(550)
EMCS					LS			(120)
SUBTOTAL								6,790
CONTINGENCY (5%)								340
TOTAL CONTRACT COST								7,130
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)								428
TOTAL REQUEST								7,558
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)								7,543
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Reinforced concrete slab, steel framing, masonry walls, and a standing seam metal roof. Includes office space, classrooms, courtroom, command post, secure storage, pre-wired workstations, demolition of nine buildings, and other necessary support. Air Conditioning: 150 Tons.								
11. REQUIREMENT: 60,736 SF ADEQUATE: 736 SF SUBSTANDARD: 96,799 SF PROJECT: Construct a mission support center. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: To consolidate the organizations for technical training center that provides command and control and service to military and civilian personnel working on the installation. A central facility will simplify operating procedures, reduce processing time and improve effectiveness. CURRENT SITUATION: Center Management and Support Group functions are presently located in eleven widely dispersed buildings on base. These buildings are over 50 year old wood frame construction and have far exceeded their life expectancy. They are structurally unsound, energy inefficient, and lack adequate electrical, mechanical, and fire protection systems. The facilities are generally inadequate in configuration and their age and condition make them uneconomical to upgrade. These nine facilities totalling 97,743 SF will be demolished upon completion of this project. IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: Continued use of these energy inefficient and poorly configured facilities will force personnel to work in substandard, cramped, and deplorable facilities. A savings in energy and maintenance cost will not be realized. ADDITIONAL: An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the								

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION LACKLAND AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS		
4. PROJECT TITLE MISSION SUPPORT CENTER	5. PROJECT NUMBER MPLS889006	
<p>alternatives of new construction, revitalization, leasing and status quo operation. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, new construction was found to be the most cost efficient over the life of the project. This project meets the criteria/scope specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide".</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																																													
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION LACKLAND AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS																																															
4. PROJECT TITLE MISSION SUPPORT CENTER	5. PROJECT NUMBER MPLS889006																																														
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <table data-bbox="264 588 1404 1176"> <tr> <td colspan="3">(1) Status:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td></td> <td>90 JUN 19</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td></td> <td>60%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td></td> <td>91 APR 25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td></td> <td>93 SEP 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(2) Basis:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td></td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td></td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td></td> <td>460</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td></td> <td>126</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td></td> <td>586</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td></td> <td>586</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(4) Construction Start</td> <td></td> <td>93 DEC</td> </tr> </table> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(1) Status:			(a) Date Design Started		90 JUN 19	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		60%	(c) Date 35% Designed		91 APR 25	(d) Date Design Complete		93 SEP 15	(2) Basis:			(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A	(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)			(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		460	(b) All Other Design Costs		126	(c) Total		586	(d) Contract			(e) In-house		586	(4) Construction Start		93 DEC
(1) Status:																																															
(a) Date Design Started		90 JUN 19																																													
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		60%																																													
(c) Date 35% Designed		91 APR 25																																													
(d) Date Design Complete		93 SEP 15																																													
(2) Basis:																																															
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO																																													
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A																																													
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)																																															
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		460																																													
(b) All Other Design Costs		126																																													
(c) Total		586																																													
(d) Contract																																															
(e) In-house		586																																													
(4) Construction Start		93 DEC																																													

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE			
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION LACKLAND AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS				4. PROJECT TITLE BASE CONTRACTING CENTER				
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 8.57.96T		6. CATEGORY CODE 610-281	7. PROJECT NUMBER MPLS929007		8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 2,450			
9. COST ESTIMATES								
ITEM					U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
BASE CONTRACTING CENTER					SF	17,300	89	1,540
SUPPORTING FACILITIES								675
COMMUNICATIONS SUPPORT					LS			(50)
UTILITIES					LS			(75)
PAVEMENTS					LS			(80)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS					LS			(60)
PREWIRED WORKSTATIONS					EA	83	3,675	(305)
DEMOLITION					SF	18,000	4	(70)
EMCS					LS			(35)
SUBTOTAL								2,215
CONTINGENCY (5%)								111
TOTAL CONTRACT COST								2,326
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)								140
TOTAL REQUEST								2,466
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)								2,450
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Concrete foundation and floor slab, masonry walls, structural frame and standing seam metal roof system. Includes pre-wired workstations, computer room, bid conference rooms, storage, demolition of one interim use facility, and other support areas. Air Conditioning: 44 Tons.								
11. REQUIREMENT: 17,300 SF ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 0 PROJECT: Construct a base contracting center. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: A permanent contracting facility is required to support the 94 permanent employees and an average of 30 contractors, vendors and design engineers which utilize the facility daily. Base contracting is the primary point of contact between base and private contractors who provide services and supplies to the base. CURRENT SITUATION: When the San Antonio Contracting Center (SACC) was disestablished on 1 October 1989, no funds were provided for a permanent facility. A relocatable building, purchased with equipment funds, was erected to support the additional 82 personnel assigned to Lackland from SAC One interim facility will be disposed of upon completion of this project. IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: No permanent solution other than the use of an interim facility. ADDITIONAL: All known alternative options were considered during the development of this project. No other option could meet the mission requirements; therefore, no economic analysis was needed or performed. This project meets the criteria/scope specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide".								

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION LACKLAND AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS																								
4. PROJECT TITLE BASE CONTRACTING CENTER	5. PROJECT NUMBER MPLS929007																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="353 625 1404 751"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 JUN 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 SEP 30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 SEP 30</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="353 814 1321 877"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="353 940 1404 1100"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>140</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>98</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>238</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>142</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>96</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 JUN 15	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 SEP 30	(d) Date Design Complete	93 SEP 30	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	140	(b) All Other Design Costs	98	(c) Total	238	(d) Contract	142	(e) In-house	96
(a) Date Design Started	92 JUN 15																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 SEP 30																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 SEP 30																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	140																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	98																							
(c) Total	238																							
(d) Contract	142																							
(e) In-house	96																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION LACKLAND AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS		4. PROJECT TITLE 7-LEVEL TRAINING DORMITORY		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 8.57.96T	6. CATEGORY CODE 721-315	7. PROJECT NUMBER MPLS953226A	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 8,900	
9. COST ESTIMATES				
ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
7-LEVEL TRAINING DORMITORY (453 PN)	SF	90,500	74	6,697
SUPPORTING FACILITIES				1,275
UTILITIES	LS			(295)
PAVEMENTS	LS			(250)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS	LS			(250)
EMCS	PT	175	1,200	(210)
PRE-WIRED TELEPHONE	SF	90,500	3	(270)
SUBTOTAL				7,972
CONTINGENCY (5%)				399
TOTAL CONTRACT COST				8,371
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)				502
TOTAL REQUEST				8,873
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)				8,900
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Concrete foundation, brick structure with standing seam metal roof. Construct private rooms with adjoining latrines, community lounges, washroom facilities and linen storage. Air Conditioning: 112 Tons. Grade Mix: 453 E5-E6.				
11. REQUIREMENT: 1,921 PN ADEQUATE: 1,468 PN SUBSTANDARD: 0 PROJECT: Construct 7-level training dormitory. (New Mission) REQUIREMENT: A major Air Force objective provides unaccompanied enlisted personnel with housing conducive to their proper rest, relaxation and personal well-being. Adequate on-base living quarters are required to accommodate enlisted student personnel attending advanced training courses and to ensure an environment conducive to studying is available. CURRENT SITUATION: Base facilities are not available to house E-5 and E-6 students that will attend 7-level training. No excess dormitory capacity exists or is projected to exist. Additional dormitory projects are programmed to either renovate current space or to construct new space to accommodate other realigned and current mission requirements. None of these increased capacities can be dedicated for this requirement. Quantity of off-base rentals are insufficient for this requirement. IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: Adequate living quarters will not be available for personnel attending 7-level training jeopardizing the 7-level training mission. ADDITIONAL: This project does not meet the criteria/scope specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide" and does not meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements". A preliminary analysis of reasonable options for accomplishing this project (status quo, renovation, upgrade,				

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION LACKLAND AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS		
4. PROJECT TITLE 7-LEVEL TRAINING DORMITORY	5. PROJECT NUMBER MPLS953226A	
<p>leasing, new construction) was done. It indicates new construction is the only option that will meet the requirements. Because of this, a full economic analysis was not performed. A certificate of exemption has been prepared.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION LACKLAND AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS																								
4. PROJECT TITLE 7-LEVEL TRAINING DORMITORY	5. PROJECT NUMBER MPLS953226A																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="330 609 1404 756"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 OCT 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 DEC 21</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 DEC 20</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="330 798 1404 882"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>YES</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>LACKLAND</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="330 924 1404 1113"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>450</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>200</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>650</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>550</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>100</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 MAR</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 OCT 15	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 DEC 21	(d) Date Design Complete	93 DEC 20	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	YES	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	LACKLAND	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	450	(b) All Other Design Costs	200	(c) Total	650	(d) Contract	550	(e) In-house	100
(a) Date Design Started	92 OCT 15																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 DEC 21																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 DEC 20																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	YES																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	LACKLAND																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	450																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	200																							
(c) Total	650																							
(d) Contract	550																							
(e) In-house	100																							

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)							2. DATE		
AIR FORCE											
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION					4. COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX			
LACKLAND TRAINING ANNEX, TEXAS					AIR TRAINING COMMAND			0.88			
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			TOTAL
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	
a. As of 30 SEP 92		56	41	14	17	55					183
b. End FY 1998		56	40	15	35	35					181
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (3,973)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)										47,419	
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:										1,170	
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:										1,200	
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)										0	
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:										0	
g. Remaining Deficiency:										0	
h. Grand Total:										49,789	
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE			SCOPE		COST (\$000)		DESIGN STATUS		
CODE									START CMPL		
214-425		VEHICLE MAINTENANCE FACILITY			8,000 SF		1,200		AUG 92 JUL 93		
							TOTAL:		1,200		
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995) NONE											
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
10. Mission or Major Functions: Some Officer Training School functions; an Air Force Materiel Command weapons distribution detachment; and an Air Force Intelligence Command detachment. Also, the temporary beddown location of the Inter-American Air Forces Academy that had been at Homestead AFB.											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:										0	
b. Water pollution:										0	
c. Occupational safety and health:										0	
d. Other Environmental:										0	

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)				2. DATE		
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION LACKLAND TRAINING ANNEX, TEXAS				4. PROJECT TITLE VEHICLE MAINTENANCE FACILITY				
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 2.80.19 TIARA		6. CATEGORY CODE 214-425		7. PROJECT NUMBER PAYZ944057		8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 1,200		
9. COST ESTIMATES								
ITEM					U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
VEHICLE MAINTENANCE FACILITY					SF	8,000	92	736
SUPPORTING FACILITIES								340
UTILITIES					LS			(120)
PAVEMENTS					LS			(75)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS					LS			(100)
DEMOLITION AND DISPOSAL					SF	4,650	10	(45)
SUBTOTAL								1,076
CONTINGENCY (5%)								54
TOTAL CONTRACT COST								1,130
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)								68
TOTAL REQUEST								1,198
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)								1,200
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Construct reinforced concrete foundation, floor slab, masonry walls (high-bay); structural steel frame with flat roof; parking area; and lighting. Includes hoist system, lubrication system, compressed air, and all utilities. Area to include tire maintenance, battery shop, bench stock, tool issue, toilets, admin area, water-oil separator and area for refueling. Air Conditioning: 10 Tons.								
11. REQUIREMENT: 8,000 SF ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 4,650 SF PROJECT: Construct a vehicle maintenance facility. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: Adequate, functionally suited facility to provide in-garrison, essential day-to-day maintenance and capability to provide depot-level support for a fleet of 150 vehicles assigned to the unit's SENIOR TROUPE mission. CURRENT SITUATION: The foundation of the 35-year-old facility is settling. In addition, space is not available in the existing facility to locate bench stock supplies and the master reference library. These functions currently are located in an adjacent area in deteriorated, portable metal buildings, and items stored in these buildings have suffered water and heat damage. IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: This unit remains the only unit of this type in the command as others were deactivated as part of the drawdown of overseas forces. This places increased importance on the readiness of this SENIOR TROUPE mission, and vehicles must remain in a high state of readiness at all times. Without an adequate vehicle maintenance facility, vehicle maintenance will continue to operate below effective levels. Numerous vehicle maintenance tasks will continue to be accomplished in uncovered areas using field methods and equipment. In-garrison major overhaul								

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION LACKLAND TRAINING ANNEX, TEXAS		
4. PROJECT TITLE VEHICLE MAINTENANCE FACILITY	5. PROJECT NUMBER PAYZ944057	
<p>capability of assigned vehicles will continue to be slow and tedious due to insufficient space.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> Demolition of the existing, substandard facility is included in this project. The unit vehicle sets are not part of the inventory of the main operating base, Lackland Air Force Base, Texas. There are no criteria for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide," or in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements."</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION LACKLAND TRAINING ANNEX, TEXAS																								
4. PROJECT TITLE VEHICLE MAINTENANCE FACILITY	5. PROJECT NUMBER PAYZ944057																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="330 617 1404 766"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 AUG 20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 SEP 17</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 JUL 28</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="330 808 1404 893"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="330 936 1404 1117"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>72</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>87</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>159</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>86</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>73</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 NOV</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 AUG 20	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 SEP 17	(d) Date Design Complete	93 JUL 28	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	72	(b) All Other Design Costs	87	(c) Total	159	(d) Contract	86	(e) In-house	73
(a) Date Design Started	92 AUG 20																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 SEP 17																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 JUL 28																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	72																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	87																							
(c) Total	159																							
(d) Contract	86																							
(e) In-house	73																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)						2. DATE			
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION LAUGHLIN AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS				4. COMMAND AIR TRAINING COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX 0.95				
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	TOTAL
a. As of 30 SEP 92		400	738	858	243						2,239
b. End FY 1998		438	684	854	224						2,200
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (5,188)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)										104,587	
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:										17,020	
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:										8,650	
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)										8,300	
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:										12,850	
g. Remaining Deficiency:										0	
h. Grand Total:										151,407	
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE			SCOPE		COST (\$000)		DESIGN STATUS		
CODE									START Cmpl		
111-111		UPGRADE AIRFIELD PAVEMENT			96,500 SY		3,250		JUN 92 DEC 93		
130-142		FIRE STATION			15,500 SF		2,400		JUL 92 OCT 93		
136-664		UPGRADE AIRFIELD LIGHTING			26,700 LF		3,000		JUN 92 DEC 93		
							TOTAL:		8,650		
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995)											
113-321		UPGRADE AIRFIELD PAVEMENT			77,000 SY		5,300				
812-223		UPGRADE ELECTRICAL DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM			91,000 LF		3,000				
							TOTAL:		8,300		
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
113-321		UPGRADE AIRFIELD PAVEMENT, PHASE 1			48,000 SY		3,000				
113-321		JPATS BEDDOWN			LS		3,450				
131-111		INFORMATION SYSTEMS FACILITY			14,000 SF		2,900				
149-962		CONTROL TOWER CAB			1 EA		1,000				
610-249		RESOURCE MANAGEMENT FACILITY			20,000 SF		2,500				
10. Mission or Major Functions: A flying training wing (T-37 and T-38 aircraft) which conducts Undergraduate Pilot Training (UPT). Also, base will undergo a T-37 to T-1 aircraft conversion.											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:										0	
b. Water pollution:										440	
c. Occupational safety and health:										0	
d. Other Environmental:										440	

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)				2. DATE		
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION LAUGHLIN AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS				4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE AIRFIELD PAVEMENT				
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 8.57.96T		6. CATEGORY CODE 111-111	7. PROJECT NUMBER MXDP933004		8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 3,250			
9. COST ESTIMATES								
ITEM					U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
UPGRADE AIRFIELD PAVEMENT					SY	96,500		2,755
ASPHALTIC CONCRETE PAVEMENT					SY	78,500	25	(1,963)
PORTLAND CEMENT CONCRETE PAVEMENT					SY	18,000	44	(792)
SUPPORTING FACILITIES								20
PAVEMENT MARKINGS					LS			(20)
SUBTOTAL								2,775
CONTINGENCY (10%)								278
TOTAL CONTRACT COST								3,053
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)								183
TOTAL REQUEST								3,236
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)								3,250
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Demolition and disposal of existing asphalt surface. Rework subgrade and install subsurface drainage system as required. Provide new 4" asphalt pavement. Reconstruct 10" Portland cement concrete touch down area. Patch portions of existing asphalt; seal cracks, and provide all pavement markings.								
11. REQUIREMENT: 96,500 SY ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 96,500 SY <u>PROJECT:</u> Upgrade airfield pavement. (Current Mission) <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> High quality airfield pavements are required to continue the large number of training flights conducted in support of the undergraduate pilot training mission. Airfield lighting project to be combined with this project to minimize airfield downtime. <u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> Inexperienced pilots fly 260 sorties per day to comply with the strict flying syllabus. The existing airfield pavement was originally constructed in 1952. The last major repair work was done during the early 1970s. Moderate to severe cracking exists throughout the runways. Touchdown zones are severely damaged and require total replacement. Testing with ground penetrating radar has detected some areas of high subsurface soil moisture content. Ponding occurs on the runways and at taxiway crossings creating potential hydroplaning/loss of aircraft control. Approximately 100 manhours/month are spent on foreign object damage (FOD) control of the deteriorated pavements. <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> FOD incidents and flight safety hazards will increase. Deterioration of existing airfield pavements will accelerate. <u>ADDITIONAL:</u> An economic analysis was not prepared because this project directly supports a mission function for which there is no available alternative but to upgrade the airfield pavement. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190.								

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION LAUGHLIN AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS		
4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE AIRFIELD PAVEMENT	5. PROJECT NUMBER MXDP933004	
<p>"Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements".</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION LAUGHLIN AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS																								
4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE AIRFIELD PAVEMENT	5. PROJECT NUMBER MXDP933004																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="360 625 1409 758"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 JUN 20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 SEP 22</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 DEC 15</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="360 821 1326 884"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="360 947 1409 1104"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>200</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>77</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>277</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>150</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>127</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 MAR</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 JUN 20	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 SEP 22	(d) Date Design Complete	93 DEC 15	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	200	(b) All Other Design Costs	77	(c) Total	277	(d) Contract	150	(e) In-house	127
(a) Date Design Started	92 JUN 20																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 SEP 22																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 DEC 15																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	200																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	77																							
(c) Total	277																							
(d) Contract	150																							
(e) In-house	127																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION LAUGHLIN AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS			4. PROJECT TITLE FIRE STATION			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 8.57.96T	6. CATEGORY CODE 130-142	7. PROJECT NUMBER MXDP889994	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 2,400			
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
FIRE STATION		SF	15,500	120	1,860	
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					310	
UTILITIES		LS			(60)	
PAVEMENTS		LS			(60)	
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(60)	
DEMOLITION/ASBESTOS REMOVAL		SF	14,600	6	(90)	
COMMUNICATIONS/EMCS		LS			(40)	
SUBTOTAL					2,170	
CONTINGENCY (5%)					109	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					2,279	
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					137	
TOTAL REQUEST					2,416	
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					2,400	
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Reinforced concrete foundation and floors, masonry walls and roof system. Includes six drive-through vehicle stalls, offices, communication center, sleeping quarters, training room, physical fitness room, fire extinguisher room, kitchen, dining room, storage, utility rooms, demolition of one building, and all necessary support. Air Conditioning: 32 Tons.						
11. REQUIREMENT: 15,500 SF ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 14,647 SF PROJECT: Construct a base fire station. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: A properly sized and configured fire station is required to provide fire protection and fire fighting services for base facilities and aircraft crash rescue/fire fighting. The station will house all fire fighting equipment and crews, a central fire alarm system, command and control and 24 hour crew quarters. CURRENT SITUATION: In 1990, \$160K in emergency funds were spent to make temporary structural repairs to keep the facility structurally sound and in operation. The existing facility is energy inefficient and requires excessive resources to maintain. There are insufficient stalls to house existing equipment and existing stalls are too narrow to properly accommodate currently assigned fire fighting vehicles. A crash truck (P-19) and a crash support truck (P-20) are parked outdoors causing rubber seals and other high cost equipment to fail due to excessive high temperatures. The existing Korean War vintage fire station is inadequately configured to properly accomplish the base fire fighting mission. There are no separate latrine or sleeping quarters for female fire fighters. Training and education is accomplished in the dining room. One building totalling 14,647 SF will be demolished upon completion of						

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION LAUGHLIN AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS		
4. PROJECT TITLE FIRE STATION	5. PROJECT NUMBER MXDP889994	
<p>this project.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Vehicles and equipment become unreliable when parked outdoors. Weathering of expensive vehicles reduces the operational life span and increases maintenance costs. Energy and maintenance costs will continue to escalate.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of new construction, revitalization, and status quo operation. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, new construction was found to be the most cost efficient over the life of the project. This project meets the criteria/scope specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide".</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																																													
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION LAUGHLIN AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS																																															
4. PROJECT TITLE FIRE STATION	5. PROJECT NUMBER MXDP889994																																														
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <table data-bbox="280 595 1420 1191"> <tr> <td colspan="3">(1) Status:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td></td> <td>92 JUL 08</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td></td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td></td> <td>92 OCT 22</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td></td> <td>93 OCT 18</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(2) Basis:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td></td> <td>NC</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td></td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td></td> <td>144</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td></td> <td>89</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td></td> <td>233</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> <td>144</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td></td> <td>89</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(4) Construction Start</td> <td></td> <td>94 JAN</td> </tr> </table> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(1) Status:			(a) Date Design Started		92 JUL 08	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%	(c) Date 35% Designed		92 OCT 22	(d) Date Design Complete		93 OCT 18	(2) Basis:			(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NC	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A	(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)			(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		144	(b) All Other Design Costs		89	(c) Total		233	(d) Contract		144	(e) In-house		89	(4) Construction Start		94 JAN
(1) Status:																																															
(a) Date Design Started		92 JUL 08																																													
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%																																													
(c) Date 35% Designed		92 OCT 22																																													
(d) Date Design Complete		93 OCT 18																																													
(2) Basis:																																															
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NC																																													
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A																																													
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)																																															
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		144																																													
(b) All Other Design Costs		89																																													
(c) Total		233																																													
(d) Contract		144																																													
(e) In-house		89																																													
(4) Construction Start		94 JAN																																													

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)		2. DATE	
AIR FORCE					
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION			4. PROJECT TITLE		
LAUGHLIN AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS			UPGRADE AIRFIELD LIGHTING		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT	6. CATEGORY CODE	7. PROJECT NUMBER	8. PROJECT COST(\$000)		
8.57.96T	136-664	MXDP933003	3,000		
9. COST ESTIMATES					
ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
UPGRADE AIRFIELD LIGHTING	LF	44,800		806	
RUNWAY LIGHTING	LF	23,500	18	(423)	
TAXIWAY LIGHTING	LF	21,300	18	(383)	
SUPPORTING FACILITIES				1,745	
DISTANCE MARKERS	LS			(370)	
THRESHOLD LIGHTING	LS			(885)	
ALSF-1 APPROACH LIGHTING-CENTER RW	LS			(280)	
VISUAL GLIDESLOPE INDICATOR	LS			(216)	
SUBTOTAL				2,551	
CONTINGENCY (10%)				255	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST				2,806	
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)				168	
TOTAL REQUEST				2,974	
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)				3,000	
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Replace all taxiway and runway lighting systems, including threshold lights, pre-threshold and terminating bar lights, distance markers, edge lights, approach lights and flasher systems, lighting cables and isolation transformers. A Precision Approach Path Indicator (PAPI) system will replace the existing VASI system.					
11. REQUIREMENT: As required. <u>PROJECT:</u> Upgrade airfield lighting. (Current Mission) <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> This project is required to properly modify, upgrade and standardize existing visual navigational aid facilities to FAA and Air Force standards. This will improve operational safety, reliability and efficiency of the airfield through the use of equipment, fixtures and materials that can be adequately maintained. This lighting upgrade was identified in the 1988 Air Training Command Master Planning Study of Airfield Lighting Systems at Laughlin AFB and is required for proper training and safety of inexperienced student pilots. <u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> Inexperienced student pilots fly 260 sorties per day to comply with the strict flying syllabus. Base experienced 8 major outages in 1991, resulting in 3-4 hours of airfield downtime per incident. Antiquated visual approach slope indicator lights cost 3 times more to operate. Threshold lighting is not in accordance with the Air Force directives. The existing cables have excessive current losses associated with advanced stages of insulation deterioration. <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Airfield will be non-operational during inclement weather/night flying. Student pilots will not meet curriculum schedules when night flying is stopped. Alternate aircraft landing site is 112 miles away.					

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION LAUGHLIN AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS		
4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE AIRFIELD LIGHTING	5. PROJECT NUMBER MXDP933003	
<p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> All known alternative options were considered during the development of this project. No other option could meet the mission requirements; therefore, no economic analysis was needed or performed. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements".</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION LAUGHLIN AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS																								
4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE AIRFIELD LIGHTING	5. PROJECT NUMBER MXDP933003																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="353 625 1404 751"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 JUN 20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 SEP 22</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 DEC 15</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="353 819 1321 882"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="353 945 1404 1102"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>185</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>80</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>265</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>190</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>75</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 MAR</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 JUN 20	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 SEP 22	(d) Date Design Complete	93 DEC 15	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	185	(b) All Other Design Costs	80	(c) Total	265	(d) Contract	190	(e) In-house	75
(a) Date Design Started	92 JUN 20																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 SEP 22																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 DEC 15																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	185																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	80																							
(c) Total	265																							
(d) Contract	190																							
(e) In-house	75																							

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)							2. DATE		
AIR FORCE											
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION					4. COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX			
RANDOLPH AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS					AIR TRAINING COMMAND			0.88			
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			TOTAL
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	
a. As of 30 SEP 92		1328	3026	2547	173			16	32	7	7,129
b. End FY 1998		1398	2777	2679	323			16	32	7	7,232
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (5,003)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92) 163,690											
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory: 3,410											
d. Authorization Requested In This Program: 5,300											
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995) 5,200											
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years: 12,550											
g. Remaining Deficiency: 0											
h. Grand Total: 190,150											
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE			SCOPE		COST (\$000)		DESIGN STATUS		
CODE									START CMPL		
149-962		CONTROL TOWER			1 EA		2,800		SEP 92 MAY 93		
812-223		UPGRADE ELECTRICAL DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM			LS		2,500		JUL 92 DEC 93		
							TOTAL:		5,300		
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995)											
113-321		JPATS BEDDOWN FACILITIES			LS		3,300				
136-664		UPGRADE AIRFIELD LIGHTING			55,700 LF		1,900				
							TOTAL:		5,200		
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
113-321		REPAIR AIRFIELD PAVEMENT RAMPS			84,000 SY		4,800				
149-962		CONTROL TOWER (WEST)			1 EA		900				
179-511		FIREMEN TRAINING FACILITY			1 EA		850				
219-944		BASE CIVIL ENGINEERING COMPLEX			50,000 SF		6,000				
10. Mission or Major Functions: HQ ATC; a flying training wing which conducts instructor pilot training (T-37 & T-38 aircraft) and Undergraduate Navigator Training (UNT) with T-43 aircraft; AF Recruiting Service; AF Management Engineering Agency; AF Military Personnel Center; AF Civilian Personnel Management Center, AF Morale, Welfare, and Recreation Agency; AF Instrument Flight Center; AF Occupational Measurement Center; HQ San Antonio Joint Military Medical Command; and an Air Mobility Command airlift detachment (C-21 aircraft).											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:										0	
b. Water pollution:										425	
c. Occupational safety and health:										0	
d. Other Environmental:										425	

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION RANDOLPH AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS		4. PROJECT TITLE CONTROL TOWER		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 3.51.14	6. CATEGORY CODE 149-962	7. PROJECT NUMBER TYMX943002	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 2,800	
9. COST ESTIMATES				
ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
CONTROL TOWER	LS			2,075
SUPPORTING FACILITIES				440
UTILITIES	LS			(120)
PAVEMENTS	LS			(55)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS	LS			(70)
DEMOLITION	LS			(55)
COMMUNICATIONS SUPPORT	LS			(55)
SPECIAL FOUNDATIONS	LS			(25)
FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEMS	LS			(10)
AIRFIELD WIRING	LS			(50)
SUBTOTAL				2,515
CONTINGENCY (5%)				126
TOTAL CONTRACT COST				2,641
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)				158
TOTAL REQUEST				2,799
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)				2,800
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Reinforced concrete footings, special foundations, floor slab, supporting superstructure, control tower cab, operations and training areas. Facility includes all site work, utilities, mechanical, electrical, fire protection, backup power systems and an elevator. Existing tower will be demolished. Air Conditioning: 20 Tons.				
11. REQUIREMENT: 1 EA ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 2 EA PROJECT: Construct an 86-foot high air traffic control tower with a 540 square foot cab. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: A new air traffic control tower with larger cab to accommodate up to 11 air traffic control personnel, air traffic control equipment, crew briefings, operations, and training functions. CURRENT SITUATION: Randolph AFB has two control towers. The west runway's control tower will be upgraded in FY97. This project replaces the east control tower constructed in 1952. The 225 SF tower cab was configured to accommodate three controllers and the standard compliment of 1950s vintage equipment. The base mission and characteristics of aircraft supported have changed since then, and more air traffic controllers and equipment are needed now handle current operations. Air traffic control operations at Randolph average 100,000 landings and take-offs annually. Randolph is home base for one hundred T-37 and T-38 pilot trainer aircraft. In FY93, the base will receive ten T-43s as part of the Mather AFB closure. IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: Overcrowded cab conditions limit air traffic controller mobility and impact controller communications with pilots. These conditions, coupled with the additional effort required to safely control inexperienced pilots learning T-37 and T-38 aircraft, create				

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION RANDOLPH AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS		
4. PROJECT TITLE CONTROL TOWER	5. PROJECT NUMBER TYMX943002	
<p>conditions that could jeopardize pilot safety and cause aircraft loss. Additional radio equipment must be installed in the cab or in close proximity to minimize signal loss between radio and antennas which would significantly impact operational capability.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> The project is part of the Air Force Control Tower upgrade program managed by Air Force Communications Command (AFCC). Upon completion of this project, the existing tower will be demolished. The economic analysis for this project considered three alternatives: status quo, modify the existing tower, and construct a new tower. Status quo would not eliminate all deficiencies, and tower modification was determined to be technically infeasible. New construction is the only viable alternative. There are no criteria for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide," or in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements."</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION RANDOLPH AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS																								
4. PROJECT TITLE CONTROL TOWER	5. PROJECT NUMBER TYMX943002																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="346 619 1420 766"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 SEP 09</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>45%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 OCT 14</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 MAY 01</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="346 808 1420 892"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="346 934 1420 1113"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>168</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>84</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>252</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>168</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>84</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 SEP 09	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	45%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 OCT 14	(d) Date Design Complete	93 MAY 01	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	168	(b) All Other Design Costs	84	(c) Total	252	(d) Contract	168	(e) In-house	84
(a) Date Design Started	92 SEP 09																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	45%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 OCT 14																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 MAY 01																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	168																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	84																							
(c) Total	252																							
(d) Contract	168																							
(e) In-house	84																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION RANDOLPH AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS			4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE ELECTRICAL DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 8.57.96T	6. CATEGORY CODE 812-223	7. PROJECT NUMBER TYMX933004	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 2,500			
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
UPGRADE ELECTRICAL DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM SUPPORTING FACILITIES		LF	37,600	37	1,391 755	
FEEDER CABLE E & S SWITCH STA-NEW DUCT CIRCUIT BREAKERS AT SWITCHING STATIONS		LF EA	16,000 2	40 57,500	(640) (115)	
SUBTOTAL					2,146	
CONTINGENCY (10%)					215	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					2,361	
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					142	
TOTAL REQUEST					2,503	
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					2,500	
10. Description of Proposed Construction: All work necessary to convert the underground 4.16 KV electrical wiring and transformers to 13.8 KV underground electrical distribution system. Areas include Feeders L, J, and 1300 area. Construct new underground feeder between the east and south switching stations.						
11. REQUIREMENT: As required. PROJECT: Upgrade the base electrical distribution system. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: Upgrade of the electrical system is required to convert to 13.8 KV service and provide reliable power in support of the ATC Training Mission at Randolph. An electrical distribution system is required that will confine power outages to manageable areas, provide needed backfeed systems, and provide modern equipment that reduce maintenance costs and meet current life safety codes. CURRENT SITUATION: The existing 4.16 KV underground electrical distribution system has deteriorated and electrical shorts have caused 12 major power outages in 1991. Eight of these outages occurred in circuit Q which feeds the east flight line and south ramp areas which includes HQ ATC facilities. Outages lasted up to 4 hours and affected entire area due to the lack of loop feeds which would have allowed outages to be confined to one or two facilities and limited them to a few minutes. Maintenance them of the system has become manpower intensive because of obsolete equipment and the difficulty in procuring parts. This project completes the conversion of the base to a more economical 13.8 KV system, matching local commercial power and minimizing the need for substations. IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: The present system will continue to deteriorate with more frequent and extensive power outages due to the inability to						

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION RANDOLPH AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS		
4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE ELECTRICAL DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM	5. PROJECT NUMBER TYMX933004	
<p>minimize the areas affected and/or duration of an outage. Mission degradation from personnel not able to perform work during outages will continue and O&M costs will continue to escalate.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of upgrade and status quo operation. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, upgrade was found to be the most cost efficient over the life of the project. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements".</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION RANDOLPH AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS																								
4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE ELECTRICAL DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM	5. PROJECT NUMBER TYMX933004																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="355 619 1412 745"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 JUL 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 OCT 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 DEC 20</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="355 808 1329 871"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="355 934 1412 1102"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>142</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>70</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>212</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>182</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>30</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 MAR</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 JUL 15	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 OCT 15	(d) Date Design Complete	93 DEC 20	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	142	(b) All Other Design Costs	70	(c) Total	212	(d) Contract	182	(e) In-house	30
(a) Date Design Started	92 JUL 15																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 OCT 15																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 DEC 20																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	142																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	70																							
(c) Total	212																							
(d) Contract	182																							
(e) In-house	30																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)					2. DATE				
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION REESE AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS				4. COMMAND AIR TRAINING COMMAND		5. AREA CONST COST INDEX 0.86					
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED		TOTAL	
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	FNL	CIV	OFF	ENL		CIV
a. As of 30 SEP 92		414	645	360	208						1,627
b. End FY 1998		425	611	358	227						1,621
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (3,953)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)											91,981
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:											0
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:											900
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)											7,200
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:											15,290
g. Remaining Deficiency:											0
h. Grand Total:											115,371
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE		SCOPE		COST (\$000)		DESIGN STATUS			
<u>CODE</u>								<u>START</u>		<u>CMP</u>	
411-135		UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS		29 EA		900		JUL 92		SEP 93	
				TOTAL:		900					
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995)											
113-321		UPGRADE AIRFIELD PAVEMENTS		110,000 SY		4,850					
136-664		UPGRADE AIRFIELD LIGHTING		41,800 LF		2,350					
				TOTAL:		7,200					
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
113-321		UPGRADE AIRFIELD PAVEMENTS/ PARKING APRON		94,000 SY		5,200					
171-213		JPATS BEDDOWN		30,000 SF		3,300					
179-511		ALTER FIREMEN TRAINING FACILITY		1 EA		690					
610-128		BASE ADMINISTRATION FACILITY		12,500 SF		1,200					
841-427		WATER STORAGE TANK		500 KG		500					
10. Mission or Major Functions: A flying training wing which conducts Undergraduate Pilot Training (UPT) with one T-37 squadron and one T-38 squadron. Also, base will undergo a T-37 to T-1 aircraft conversion.											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:											0
b. Water pollution:											345
c. Occupational safety and health:											0
d. Other Environmental:											345

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)							2. DATE		
AIR FORCE											
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION					4. COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX			
SHEPPARD AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS					AIR TRAINING COMMAND			0.94			
6. PERSONNEL		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			
STRENGTH		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	TOTAL
a. As of 30 SEP 92		666	2295	1050	332	3308	101	1	221		7,974
b. End FY 1998		711	3083	1567	110	2985	20	61	1711	12	10,260
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (5,480)									
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)										247,423	
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:										30,590	
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:										18,030	
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)										4,800	
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:										16,800	
g. Remaining Deficiency:										0	
h. Grand Total:										317,643	
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE			SCOPE		COST (\$000)		DESIGN STATUS		
CODE									START		CMLP
171-211		ENJJPT ALTER FLIGHT TRAINING FACILITY			40,000 SF		2,200		JUN 92		OCT 93
179-511		FIRE TRAINING FACILITY					LS 850		SEP 92		NOV 93
721-315		7-LEVEL TRAINING DORMITORY			156,500 SF		14,200		OCT 92		DEC 93
740-884		ADD TO AND ALTER CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER			4,800 SF		780		JUL 92		DEC 93
							TOTAL:		18,030		
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995)											
136-664		UPGRADE AIRFIELD LIGHTING			33,400 LF		1,300				
171-621		7-LEVEL TRAINING CLASSROOMS			21,000 SF		3,500				
							TOTAL:		4,800		
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
110-000		REPAIR AIRFIELD PAVEMENTS (RAMP)					LS 3,800				
131-111		INFORMATION SYSTEMS FACILITY			20,000 SF		3,000				
171-623		COVERED AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT TRAINING FACILITY			8,500 SF		1,000				
442-758		LOGISTICS COMPLEX			154,000 SF		9,000				
10. Mission or Major Functions: Training center for aircraft maintenance, civil engineering, comptroller, transportation, and health science courses; a flying training wing with three squadrons (T-37 and T-38 aircraft) that trains US and NATO pilots under the Euro-NATO Joint Jet Pilot Training Program; a medical services training group; and a field training group.											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:										0	
b. Water pollution:										0	
c. Occupational safety and health:										0	
d. Other Environmental:										0	

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)				2. DATE		
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION SHEPPARD AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS			4. PROJECT TITLE ENJJPT ALTER FLIGHT TRAINING FACILITY					
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 8.47.44		6. CATEGORY CODE 171-211	7. PROJECT NUMBER VNVP933005		8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 2,200			
9. COST ESTIMATES								
ITEM					U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
ENJJPT ALTER FLIGHT TRAINING FACILITY					SF	40,000	29	1,160
SUPPORTING FACILITIES								715
REMOVE TYPICAL ASBESTOS MATLS					LS			(100)
COMMUNICATIONS SUPPORT					LS			(60)
UPGRADE HVAC SYSTEM					TN	400	1,000	(400)
INSTALL FIRE SPRINKLER SYSTEM					SF	75,000	1	(75)
INSTALL ELEVATOR					LS			(80)
SUBTOTAL								1,875
CONTINGENCY (10%)								188
TOTAL CONTRACT COST								2,063
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)								124
TOTAL REQUEST								2,187
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)								2,200
10. Description of Proposed Construction: All work necessary to expand existing classrooms and flight training rooms. Work will include removing and reconstructing interior walls; altering electrical, mechanical and cooling systems; upgrade all latrines; install fire sprinkler system; install an elevator; asbestos removal where necessary; and provide communications support where required. Air Conditioning: 400 Tons.								
11. REQUIREMENT: 76,822 SF ADEQUATE: 36,822 SF SUBSTANDARD: 0 <u>PROJECT</u> : Alter flight training facility for the Euro-NATO Joint Jet Pilot Training (ENJJPT). (New Mission) <u>REQUIREMENT</u> : A facility to provide adequate classrooms and flight training rooms in support of the permanent beddown of the ENJJPT mission to the year 2005. Approximately 50% of the students are from foreign countries with limited use of the English language and require quiet classrooms to maximize their comprehension and understanding of the curriculum. <u>CURRENT SITUATION</u> : Sheppard is currently the Undergraduate Pilot Training (UPT) base for the ENJJPT program. Students and instructors are utilizing crowded training rooms. Students are not allowed to bring books or outer apparel into the existing flight rooms because of lack of space. Existing latrines and HVAC system are antiquated and cannot properly support the building occupants. Space to be altered becomes available with the completion of the FY91 Wing Operations Facility. To extend the ENJJPT program to the year 2005, the NATO Ministers of Defense and the US SECDEF directed the facility be altered. The ENJJPT Steering Committee subsequently approved this project and budgeted for the foreign-funded share (50%) of the cost. Funds will be available at time of award.								

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION SHEPPARD AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS		
4. PROJECT TITLE ENJJPT ALTER FLIGHT TRAINING FACILITY	5. PROJECT NUMBER VNVP933005	
<p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Will violate the country-to-country agreement with all ENJJPT nations. Students will remain in mass briefing/debriefing rooms which are overcrowded, noisy, and a distraction to individual mission briefings.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> Total project cost of \$4,400,000 will be shared by Air Force and ENJJPT nations. An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of new construction, revitalization, leasing and status quo operation. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, alteration was found to be the most cost efficient over the life of the project. This project meets the criteria/scope specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide".</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION SHEPPARD AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS																								
4. PROJECT TITLE ENJJPT ALTER FLIGHT TRAINING FACILITY	5. PROJECT NUMBER VNVP933005																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="346 625 1404 756"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 JUN 30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 SEP 31</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 OCT 17</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="346 819 1321 882"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="346 945 1404 1102"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>125</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>165</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>115</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>50</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 JAN</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 JUN 30	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 SEP 31	(d) Date Design Complete	93 OCT 17	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	125	(b) All Other Design Costs	40	(c) Total	165	(d) Contract	115	(e) In-house	50
(a) Date Design Started	92 JUN 30																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 SEP 31																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 OCT 17																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	125																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	40																							
(c) Total	165																							
(d) Contract	115																							
(e) In-house	50																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)		2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION SHEPPARD AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS		4. PROJECT TITLE 7-LEVEL TRAINING DORMITORY	
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 8.57.96T	6. CATEGORY CODE 721-315	7. PROJECT NUMBER VNVP943004A	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 14,200

9. COST ESTIMATES				
ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
7-LEVEL TRAINING DORMITORY (782 PN)	SF	156,500	69	10,799
SUPPORTING FACILITIES				1,980
UTILITIES/EMCS	LS			(890)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS	LS			(595)
PAVEMENTS	LS			(295)
COMMUNITCATION SUPPORT	LS			(200)
SUBTOTAL				12,779
CONTINGENCY (5%)				639
TOTAL CONTRACT COST				13,418
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)				805
TOTAL REQUEST				14,223
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)				14,200

10. Description of Proposed Construction: Masonry walls with brick veneer, concrete foundation and floor slabs, structural frame and metal roof system. Includes room-bath-room modules, freight elevator, linen storage and maids room, mechanical equipment room, communications, utilities, parking, and any other support facilities.
Air Conditioning: 200 Tons. Grade Mix: 782 E5-E6.

11. REQUIREMENT: 8,450 SF ADEQUATE: 6,548 SF SUBSTANDARD: 0
PROJECT: Construct 7-level training dormitory. (New Mission)
REQUIREMENT: A major Air Force objective is to provide unaccompanied enlisted personnel with housing conducive to their proper rest, relaxation and personal well-being. Adequate on-base living quarters are required to accommodate enlisted student personnel attending advanced training courses and to ensure that an environment conducive to studying is available.
CURRENT SITUATION: The base has insufficient facilities to accommodate unaccompanied enlisted personnel who will attend 7-level training at Sheppard AFB. Dormitory space is available only for the current manning. Other dormitory space is currently under construction or in design to accommodate personnel moves in conjunction with the Base Closure and this requirement. This project will satisfy the total requirement for personnel receiving 7-level training.
IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: Adequate living quarters will not be available for personnel attending 7-level training jeopardizing the 7-level training mission.
ADDITIONAL: This project does not meet the criteria/scope specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide" and does not meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements". A preliminary analysis of reasonable

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION SHEPPARD AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS		
4. PROJECT TITLE 7-LEVEL TRAINING DORMITORY	5. PROJECT NUMBER VNVP943004A	
<p>options for accomplishing this project was done. It indicates that new construction is the only option that will meet the requirements. Because of this, a full economic analysis was not performed. A certificate of exemption has ben prepared.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION SHEPPARD AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS																								
4. PROJECT TITLE 7-LEVEL TRAINING DORMITORY	5. PROJECT NUMBER VNVP943004A																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 OCT 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 DEC 31</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 DEC 20</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>YES</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>SHEPPARD</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>710</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>300</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>1010</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>920</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>90</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 APR</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 OCT 15	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 DEC 31	(d) Date Design Complete	93 DEC 20	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	YES	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	SHEPPARD	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	710	(b) All Other Design Costs	300	(c) Total	1010	(d) Contract	920	(e) In-house	90
(a) Date Design Started	92 OCT 15																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 DEC 31																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 DEC 20																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	YES																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	SHEPPARD																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	710																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	300																							
(c) Total	1010																							
(d) Contract	920																							
(e) In-house	90																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)						2. DATE			
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION HILL AIR FORCE BASE, UTAH				4. COMMAND AIR FORCE MATERIEL COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX 0.98				
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	TOTAL
a. As of 30 SEP 92		660	4301	10898							15,859
b. End FY 1998		582	3558	9045							13,185
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (8,144)									
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)										563,787	
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:										29,600	
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:										8,380	
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)										6,900	
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:										52,600	
g. Remaining Deficiency:										0	
h. Grand Total:										661,267	
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE		SCOPE		COST (\$000)		DESIGN STATUS			
CODE								START		CMPL	
179-511		FIRE TRAINING FACILITY (DBOF)		1 EA		880		JUL 92		SEP 93	
831-155		UPGRADE INDUSTRIAL WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT (DBOF)		1,500 KG		5,100		JUL 92		NOV 93	
842-245		UPGRADE WATER DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM		13,300 LF		2,400		APR 92		SEP 93	
						TOTAL:		8,380			
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995)											
130-142		ADD TO AND ALTER FIRE STATION		8,050 SF		1,100					
821-113		UPGRADE STEAM DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM		LS		2,400					
880-000		CORRECT FIRE PROTECTION DEFICIENCIES		930,000 SF		3,400					
						TOTAL:		6,900			
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
132-133		RANGE INSTRUCTIONAL SITES		10 EA		6,000					
171-620		MOBILITY TRAINING AND SUPPORT FACILITY		48,000 SF		4,000					
441-758		SUPPLY SUPPORT FACILITY		65,000 SF		4,600					
610-144		MUNITIONS MAINTENANCE CONTROL FACILITY		14,000 SF		2,400					
610-243		COMBAT SUPPORT CENTER		60,000 SF		7,000					
10. Mission or Major Functions: Ogden Air Logistics Center which is responsible for logistics management, support and depot-level maintenance of F-4 and F-16 aircraft, Minuteman and Peacekeeper ICBM's, Maverick missiles, and laser-guided bombs; a test group (HH-1 and MH-60 helicopters, and DC/HC/NC 130 aircraft); an Air Combat Command fighter wing with three F-16 squadrons, and an Air Force Reserve fighter wing (F-16 aircraft).											

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)							2. DATE		
AIR FORCE											
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION					4. COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX			
HILL AIR FORCE BASE, UTAH					AIR FORCE MATERIEL COMMAND			0.98			
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			TOTAL
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	
a. As of											
b. End FY											
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage:											
b. Inventory Total As Of:											
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:											
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:											
e. Authorization Included In Following Program:											
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:											
g. Remaining Deficiency:											
h. Grand Total:											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:											4,000
b. Water pollution:											6,200
c. Occupational safety and health:											2,300
d. Other Environmental:											8,000

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION HILL AIR FORCE BASE, UTAH		4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE INDUSTRIAL WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT (DBOF)		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 7.80.56	6. CATEGORY CODE 831-155	7. PROJECT NUMBER KRSM943032	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 5,100	
9. COST ESTIMATES				
ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
UPGRADE INDUSTRIAL WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT (DBOF)	KG	1,500	2,290	3,435
SUPPORTING FACILITIES				945
UTILITIES	LS			(295)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS	LS			(155)
STORAGE BUILDING	SF	1,600	50	(80)
REMOVE CONTAMINATED SOIL	LS			(295)
O&M MANUAL, TRAINING AND START-UP	LS			(120)
SUBTOTAL				4,380
CONTINGENCY (10%)				438
TOTAL CONTRACT COST				4,818
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)				289
TOTAL REQUEST				5,107
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)				5,100
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Remove concrete tanks, install new processing equipment and automated control system, and replace instrumentation. Includes necessary piping, accessories and site work, removal of existing tanks, construction of a 1600 SF storage building, removal of contaminated soil as required, and 180 day start-up operation and system certification.				
11. REQUIREMENT: 1,500 KG ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 1,500 KG PROJECT: Upgrade an industrial wastewater treatment plant. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: This is a Level II environmental compliance project. An adequate industrial wastewater treatment plant (IWTP) is required to remove pollutants from industrial wastewater generated from the depot's maintenance activities, including aircraft and jet engine overhaul, metal plating, painting and paint stripping. The treatment process must produce an effluent which meets the discharge pretreatment limits set by the North Davis County Sewer District. It is anticipated by 1995 that these pretreatment limits will be much lower as North Davis County further controls user discharges to allow themselves to meet lower Clean Water Act limits for toxicity and hazardous waste limits on sludge refuse. CURRENT SITUATION: The existing IWTP, built in 1970 and expanded in 1979, operates between 300 and 600 gallons per minute (gpm). It cannot consistently remove metals to the low concentrations required by the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System permit prior to discharge into a local waterway. This permit expires December 31, 1994, at which time the discharge limits governing Hill will likely be far more restrictive. District officials have advised base officials that new limits will be provided by August 1993. The clarifiers are too small to				

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION HILL AIR FORCE BASE, UTAH		
4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE INDUSTRIAL WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER KRSM943032	
<p>provide sufficient settling of heavy metals at flows above 350 gpm. The emergency spill tank does not have capacity to store over one hour's accumulation of wastes, and the grit chamber must be manually cleaned four or five times per year. The manual control system does not allow for real time monitoring of the plant's operating parameters, resulting in delays of up to 48 hours before necessary adjustments can be made. This situation resulted in 12 days of noncompliance leading to two notices of violation in FY 1991.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> The capability of the IWTP to stay in compliance with its permit limits, the Clean Water Act and RCRA will be in jeopardy. Fines or other enforcement actions, including shutdown or reduction of depot maintenance activities that generate wastewater, are a distinct possibility if the project is not provided.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There is no criteria/scope for this project in either Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide" or Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements". A life cycle economic analysis has been performed comparing all reasonable options for accomplishing this project (status quo, renovation, new construction, and contracting out the function). This analysis indicates that alteration is clearly the best alternative over the life of the facility.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION HILL AIR FORCE BASE, UTAH																								
4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE INDUSTRIAL WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER KRSM943032																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="360 625 1433 758"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 JUL 02</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 DEC 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 NOV 30</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="360 821 1433 884"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>YES</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>HILL</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="360 947 1433 1104"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>300</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>201</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>501</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>399</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>102</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 FEB</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 JUL 02	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 DEC 01	(d) Date Design Complete	93 NOV 30	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	YES	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	HILL	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	300	(b) All Other Design Costs	201	(c) Total	501	(d) Contract	399	(e) In-house	102
(a) Date Design Started	92 JUL 02																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 DEC 01																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 NOV 30																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	YES																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	HILL																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	300																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	201																							
(c) Total	501																							
(d) Contract	399																							
(e) In-house	102																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION HILL AIR FORCE BASE, UTAH		4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE WATER DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 7.28.96	6. CATEGORY CODE 842-245	7. PROJECT NUMBER KRSM913003	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 2,400	

9. COST ESTIMATES				
ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
UPGRADE WATER DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM	LS			1,819
WATER DISTRIBUTION MAINS	LF	15,800	93	(1,469)
RESERVOIR COVER	LS			(350)
SUPPORTING FACILITIES				240
UTILITIES	LS			(100)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS	LS			(140)
SUBTOTAL				2,059
CONTINGENCY (10%)				206
TOTAL CONTRACT COST				2,265
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)				136
TOTAL REQUEST				2,401
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)				2,400

10. Description of Proposed Construction: Install 15,800 feet of water main, including necessary valves, manholes, hydrants, and corrosion control; install additional valves on existing pipe; replace cover on 3.5 million gallon reservoir; restore pavements and landscape.

11. REQUIREMENT: As required.
PROJECT: Upgrade water distribution system. (Current Mission)
REQUIREMENT: The water distribution system must be upgraded to meet pressure and fire protection flow requirements for depot aircraft maintenance, munitions storage area and warehouse complex. Larger primary water mains from the base's two largest reservoirs (4.5 million gallon total capacity) to the munitions storage area are needed to meet fire flow and pressure requirements. New valves are needed to isolate sections of water mains when repair is required. A rigid cover (180 feet by 120 feet) for the 3.5 million gallon reservoir is needed to provide a reliable debris barrier, prevent algae growth and protect water resources
CURRENT SITUATION: The primary water mains from the bases's two largest reservoirs are not sized for pressure and fire flow requirements resulting from additional facility construction at Hill AFB over the last 25 years. Further, the water mains have accumulated mineral deposits that reduce the effective size of the pipe. Even though water storage capacity is adequate, the means of transmission is deficient. A computer analysis shows that, without larger lines to the two remote reservoirs, the reservoir serving the warehouse area (1.25 million gallons) could be drawn down at a rate of 5300 gallons per minute during peak demand periods. In less than an hour the tank level would drop below the 1 million gallons required for firefighting in this area. The lack of adequate pressure and fire flow has been given a Fire Safety Deficiency (FSD) priority 2-C-III.

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION HILL AIR FORCE BASE, UTAH		
4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE WATER DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM	5. PROJECT NUMBER KRSM913003	
<p>The existing 3.5 million gallon reservoir has a thin polypropylene floating cover, which is highly susceptible to rips and tears during freezing conditions and must be replaced every two years. Floating covers are rarely used on potable water reservoirs as they are difficult to maintain, easily penetrated and have a high risk of contamination. County health officials have stated concerns that the chemicals used on the adjacent golf course may contaminate the reservoir.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> The depot maintenance and warehouse areas will continue to be compromised due to the lack of adequate fire flow and pressure. A large fire could burn unsuppressed due to lack of water.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There is no criteria/scope for this project in either Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide", or AFM 86-2. All known alternative options were considered during the development of this project. No other option could meet the mission requirements; therefore, a full economic analysis was not needed or performed. A certificate of exemption has been prepared.</p>		

1. COMPONENT	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
AIR FORCE		
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION		
HILL AIR FORCE BASE, UTAH		
4. PROJECT TITLE	5. PROJECT NUMBER	
UPGRADE WATER DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM	KRS913003	
12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:		
a. Estimated Design Data:		
(1) Status:		
(a) Date Design Started		92 APR 23
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%
(c) Date 35% Designed		92 JUL 30
(d) Date Design Complete		93 SEP 11
(2) Basis:		
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e):		
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		(\$000) 128
(b) All Other Design Costs		141
(c) Total		269
(d) Contract		184
(e) In-house		85
(4) Construction Start		
93 DEC		
b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A		

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)							2. DATE		
AIR FORCE											
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION					4. COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX			
LANGLEY AIR FORCE BASE, VIRGINIA					AIR COMBAT COMMAND			0.92			
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			TOTAL
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	
a. As of 30 SEP 92		2259	6511	1859	64	106	10	3	11	19	10,842
b. End FY 1998		2185	6612	1863	64	106	10	3	11	19	10,873
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (3,440)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92) 249,505											
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory: 19,000											
d. Authorization Requested In This Program: 17,823											
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995) 0											
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years: 19,300											
g. Remaining Deficiency: 0											
h. Grand Total: 305,628											
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE		SCOPE		COST (\$000)		DESIGN STATUS			
CODE								START		CML	
130-142		FIRE STATION		23,700 SF		3,850		JUL 91		AUG 93	
141-745		ADD TO AND ALTER CARS OPERATIONS FACILITY				LS 5,373		NOV 92		AUG 93	
219-944		BASE ENGINEERING COMPLEX, PHASE II				LS 4,000		OCT 92		JUL 93	
411-135		UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS				LS 500		NOV 92		AUG 93	
851-142		RESTORE KING STREET BRIDGE				LS 4,100		OCT 91		MAY 93	
						TOTAL: 17,823					
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995) NONE											
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
211-159		ACFT CORROSION CONTROL FCLTY		30,000 SF		5,500					
214-425		ADD TO VEHICLE MAINTENANCE FACILITY		5,200 SF		1,100					
721-315		ALTER TRANSIENT DORMITORY		140 PN		2,000					
740-674		PHYSICAL FITNESS CENTER		24,000 SF		2,500					
740-884		CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER		18,000 SF		2,700					
10. Mission or Major Functions: Headquarters Air Combat Command; a fighter wing with three fighter squadrons (F-15 aircraft); an aircraft delivery group; an air intelligence group; the Air Combat Operations School; and an Air Mobility Command airlift detachment with C-21 aircraft.											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:										0	
b. Water pollution:										4,000	
c. Occupational safety and health:										0	
d. Other Environmental:										0	

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION LANGLEY AIR FORCE BASE, VIRGINIA				4. PROJECT TITLE FIRE STATION		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 2.75.96C		6. CATEGORY CODE 130-142	7. PROJECT NUMBER MUHJ923032		8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 3,850	
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
FIRE STATION		SF	23,700	95	2,252	
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					1,185	
UTILITIES		LS			(220)	
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(230)	
PAVEMENTS		LS			(240)	
SPECIAL FOUNDATIONS		LS			(95)	
COMMUNICATIONS SUPPORT		LS			(115)	
DEMOLITION		SF	18,900	5	(95)	
ASBESTOS REMOVAL		SF	18,900	10	(190)	
SUBTOTAL					3,437	
CONTINGENCY (5%)					172	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					3,609	
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					217	
TOTAL REQUEST					3,826	
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					3,850	
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Reinforced concrete foundation and floor, masonry walls, and pitched roof. Includes vehicle stalls, offices, communication center, sleeping quarters, training rooms, exercise room, kitchen, dining room, storage and utility room, parking, access pavements, demolition and all necessary support. Air Conditioning: 70 Tons.						
11. REQUIREMENT: 23,700 SF ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 18,900 SF PROJECT: Construct a central fire station. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: A properly sized and configured fire station is required to provide fire protection for base facilities and aircraft crash rescue. The station must provide space to house fire fighting equipment and crews, a central fire alarm system, command and control, 24-hour crew quarters, exercise room, storage for operating supplies and chemical agents, and maintenance functions. CURRENT SITUATION: The existing facility is experiencing structural failure (deformation/buckling of columns, footings, slabs, ceiling and walls) due to the southward thrust of ramp pavement from thermal expansion/subsurface drift. Fire fighters that work and sleep (24 hours/day) in this structurally unsound facility are exposed to a serious safety hazard. Even after the building had been shored/reinforced with beams, there is still structural shifting and movement in the facility. The most recent corrective action was attempted in 1990. This effort to repair the footings has already failed due to the unprecedented ground movement. An independent engineering consulting firm has confirmed that inevitable structural failure will occur. The facility is an undersized Korean War-era concrete masonry building that will be demolished upon completion of this project.						

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION LANGLEY AIR FORCE BASE, VIRGINIA		
4. PROJECT TITLE FIRE STATION	5. PROJECT NUMBER MUHJ923032	
<p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Personnel and equipment will continue to be placed under unnecessary and unacceptable risk. The Air Force will continue to assume the liability for the safety of personnel in a building that is experiencing structural failure.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of new construction, revitalization, leasing and status quo operation. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, new construction was found to be the most cost efficient over the life of the project. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements".</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																																													
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION LANGLEY AIR FORCE BASE, VIRGINIA																																															
4. PROJECT TITLE FIRE STATION	5. PROJECT NUMBER MUHJ923032																																														
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <table data-bbox="343 596 1483 1171"> <tr> <td colspan="3">(1) Status:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td></td> <td>91 JUL 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td></td> <td>65%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td></td> <td>91 OCT 04</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td></td> <td>93 AUG 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(2) Basis:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td></td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td></td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td></td> <td>197</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td></td> <td>149</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td></td> <td>346</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> <td>231</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td></td> <td>115</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(4) Construction Start</td> <td></td> <td>93 DEC</td> </tr> </table> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(1) Status:			(a) Date Design Started		91 JUL 01	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		65%	(c) Date 35% Designed		91 OCT 04	(d) Date Design Complete		93 AUG 01	(2) Basis:			(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A	(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)			(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		197	(b) All Other Design Costs		149	(c) Total		346	(d) Contract		231	(e) In-house		115	(4) Construction Start		93 DEC
(1) Status:																																															
(a) Date Design Started		91 JUL 01																																													
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		65%																																													
(c) Date 35% Designed		91 OCT 04																																													
(d) Date Design Complete		93 AUG 01																																													
(2) Basis:																																															
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO																																													
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A																																													
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)																																															
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		197																																													
(b) All Other Design Costs		149																																													
(c) Total		346																																													
(d) Contract		231																																													
(e) In-house		115																																													
(4) Construction Start		93 DEC																																													

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)				2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION LANGLEY AIR FORCE BASE, VIRGINIA			4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO AND ALTER CARS OPERATIONS FACILITY				
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 3.13.17 NFIP		6. CATEGORY CODE 141-745	7. PROJECT NUMBER MUHJ943010		8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 5,373		
9. COST ESTIMATES							
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)		
ADD TO AND ALTER CARS OPERATIONS FACILITY		SF	62,900		3,419		
CONVERT TO HARDWARE MAINT (SCIF)		SF	10,400	120	(1,248)		
CONVERT TO DGS WAREHOUSE		SF	22,000	47	(1,034)		
CONVERT TO DGS HANGAR BAY		SF	17,000	20	(340)		
CONVERT TO TRAINING		SF	13,500	59	(797)		
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					1,185		
UTILITIES		LS			(495)		
PAVEMENTS		LS			(295)		
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(395)		
SUBTOTAL					4,604		
CONTINGENCY (10%)					460		
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					5,064		
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					304		
TOTAL REQUEST					5,368		
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					5,373		
10. Description of Proposed Construction: All electrical, structural and mechanical work to convert various existing facilities to operations, training, and maintenance support areas for the Contingency Airborne Reconnaissance System (CARS). Certain facilities will contain Sensitive Compartmented Information Facility (SCIF) areas. Work also includes all sitework, pavements and utilities required for support. Air Conditioning: 350 Tons.							
11. REQUIREMENT: 78,000 LS ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 0 PROJECT: Add to and Alter existing facilities for the Contingency Airborne Reconnaissance System (CARS) complex. (New Mission) REQUIREMENT: Permanent facilities of adequate size and configuration are required to accommodate the beddown of the CARS Deployable Ground Station (DGS). Adequate facilities are essential to support training, operational and maintenance missions of the DGS. CARS is a unique system that is capable of collection, processing and exploitation of multi-source intelligence with multi-level security. This system is needed to enhance theater commanders' ability to most effectively manage tactical assets on the battlefield through near-real-time intelligence. In garrison, the system will support requirements such as counterdrug and treaty verification. Facilities must be prepared in FY94 for initial system receipt. CURRENT SITUATION: CARS was originally programmed for beddown in Europe. Congress cancelled the European beddown and directed a US based ground station with the capability to provide deployable assets directly to theater commanders. The facilities proposed for alteration for CARS were vacated in late 1991. These facilities are not currently configured to support the CARS mission and need to be reconfigured.							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION LANGLEY AIR FORCE BASE, VIRGINIA		
4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO AND ALTER CARS OPERATIONS FACILITY	5. PROJECT NUMBER MUHJ943010	
<p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> CARS DGS is the only system in existence, or currently programmed, that will be capable of collection, processing, and exploitation of signal intelligence and imagery intelligence with multi-level security. Without adequate facilities to support the mission, the US defense posture will be degraded by the loss of this unparalleled capability to provide dynamic, responsive intelligence support to air component/theater commanders.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". All known alternative options were considered during the development of this project. No other option could meet the mission requirements; therefore, no economic analysis was needed or performed.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION LANGLEY AIR FORCE BASE, VIRGINIA																								
4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO AND ALTER CARS OPERATIONS FACILITY	5. PROJECT NUMBER MUHJ943010																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 NOV 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 DEC 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 AUG 15</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>298</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>303</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>275</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>28</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 NOV 01	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 DEC 15	(d) Date Design Complete	93 AUG 15	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	298	(b) All Other Design Costs	5	(c) Total	303	(d) Contract	275	(e) In-house	28
(a) Date Design Started	92 NOV 01																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 DEC 15																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 AUG 15																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	298																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	5																							
(c) Total	303																							
(d) Contract	275																							
(e) In-house	28																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION LANGLEY AIR FORCE BASE, VIRGINIA			4. PROJECT TITLE BASE ENGINEERING COMPLEX, PHASE II			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 2.75.96C	6. CATEGORY CODE 219-944	7. PROJECT NUMBER MUHJ953004	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 4,000			
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
BASE ENGINEERING COMPLEX, PHASE II		SF	55,000		3,280	
BCE MANAGEMENT FACILITY		SF	30,000	76	(2,280)	
BCE STORAGE FACILITY		SF	25,000	40	(1,000)	
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					275	
UTILITIES		LS			(205)	
PAVEMENTS		SY	1,100	32	(35)	
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(35)	
SUBTOTAL					3,555	
CONTINGENCY (5%)					178	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					3,733	
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6.5%)					243	
TOTAL REQUEST					3,976	
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					4,000	
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Reinforced concrete foundations and floor slabs, pre-engineered metal frames, split face concrete masonry veneer, pitched standing seam metal roofs and facias. Project includes all utilities, pavements and site improvements.						
11. REQUIREMENT: 100,484 LS ADEQUATE: 12,916 LS SUBSTANDARD: 93,369 LS PROJECT: Construct Base Civil Engineer (BCE) complex, Phase II. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: Adequate BCE facilities are required to plan, program and implement projects to maintain, repair, operate and construct facilities, pavements, and utility systems in support of the base, HQ ACC, and Air Force missions. This project is a required follow-on to the FY 93 MILCON project, "Base Civil Engineering Complex Phase 1." CURRENT SITUATION: BCE shop and warehouse functions are housed in facilities that are undersized, functionally misconfigured and unsuitable for upgrade for their current use. Existing BCE functions are dispersed throughout 20 facilities on base. The BCE functions are being displaced by the standup of Air Combat Command and the resulting requirement for facilities in the headquarters area. These facilities are located in the congested headquarters administrative area; narrow streets, parked cars, large delivery vehicles, and special purpose vehicles make access difficult and create numerous traffic hazards. Overcrowded and cramped shops make it difficult and unsafe for the operation of machinery and power tools. Substandard covered storage facilities do not accommodate modern material storage and handling practices. Material storage is inadequate, and as a result, materials requiring indoor storage must be stored outdoors, which accelerates deterioration. IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: BCE personnel will continue to work in						

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION LANGLEY AIR FORCE BASE, VIRGINIA		
4. PROJECT TITLE BASE ENGINEERING COMPLEX, PHASE II	5. PROJECT NUMBER MUHJ953004	
<p>substandard, inefficient, and overcrowded facilities which will adversely impact their capability to support missions of the 1st Fighter Wing, HQ ACC and other units assigned to this installation.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> This project meets the criteria/scope specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". An economic analysis has been prepared comparing all known alternatives. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives new construction was found to be the most cost efficient over the life of the project.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																																													
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION LANGLEY AIR FORCE BASE, VIRGINIA																																															
4. PROJECT TITLE BASE ENGINEERING COMPLEX, PHASE II	5. PROJECT NUMBER MUHJ953004																																														
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <table data-bbox="330 588 1478 1176"> <tr> <td colspan="3">(1) Status:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td></td> <td>92 OCT 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td></td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td></td> <td>92 NOV 23</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td></td> <td>93 JUL 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(2) Basis:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td></td> <td>242</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td></td> <td>110</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td></td> <td>352</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> <td>242</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td></td> <td>110</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(4) Construction Start</td> <td></td> <td>93 DEC</td> </tr> </table> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(1) Status:			(a) Date Design Started		92 OCT 15	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%	(c) Date 35% Designed		92 NOV 23	(d) Date Design Complete		93 JUL 15	(2) Basis:			(a) Standard or Definitive Design -			(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -			(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)			(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		242	(b) All Other Design Costs		110	(c) Total		352	(d) Contract		242	(e) In-house		110	(4) Construction Start		93 DEC
(1) Status:																																															
(a) Date Design Started		92 OCT 15																																													
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%																																													
(c) Date 35% Designed		92 NOV 23																																													
(d) Date Design Complete		93 JUL 15																																													
(2) Basis:																																															
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -																																															
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -																																															
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)																																															
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		242																																													
(b) All Other Design Costs		110																																													
(c) Total		352																																													
(d) Contract		242																																													
(e) In-house		110																																													
(4) Construction Start		93 DEC																																													

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)				2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION LANGLEY AIR FORCE BASE, VIRGINIA				4. PROJECT TITLE RESTORE KING STREET BRIDGE			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 2.75.96C		6. CATEGORY CODE 851-142		7. PROJECT NUMBER MUHJ933001		8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 4,100	
9. COST ESTIMATES							
ITEM				U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
RESTORE KING STREET BRIDGE				LF	1,850	1,920	3,552
SUPPORTING FACILITIES							140
UTILITIES				LS			(30)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS				LS			(10)
DEMOLITION				SF	25,000	4	(100)
SUBTOTAL							3,692
CONTINGENCY (5%)							185
TOTAL CONTRACT COST							3,877
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)							233
TOTAL REQUEST							4,110
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)							4,100
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Replace entire concrete deck, sidewalk, parapets and hardware. Replace all superstructure steel girders, girder bearing pads and anchor bolts. Repair damaged pilings. Install elastomeric bearing pad under bridge seats and new expansion joint assemblies. Replace all corroded utility supports and perform all necessary support.							
11. REQUIREMENT: As required. PROJECT: Restore King Street Bridge. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: An adequate, safe access bridge is required at the King Street entrance to Langley AFB to accommodate vehicular traffic entering and leaving the base. The King Street Bridge crosses the Back River and connects the eastern portion of Langley AFB with the city of Hampton. It is the primary route from Hampton to the main family housing area on Langley and to the Air Combat Command Headquarters complex. Large numbers of assigned personnel use the bridge to commute to and from major residential areas in Hampton. Approximately 13,000 vehicles cross the bridge each day. Additionally, the city strongly supports continued viability of the bridge. Alternative routes through the city to Langley are already overburdened. If the bridge was not available, increased traffic on alternative city streets would create long delays, adversely impacting residents and businesses. Weight limits on the bridge have been reduced to a level where fire trucks, semi-trailers, fuel trucks and construction vehicles must take longer routes to use other entrances. CURRENT SITUATION: The King Street Bridge is in imminent danger of structural failure due to severe and rapidly accelerating deterioration. It must be repaired immediately to avert failure and the real possibility of injuries and property damage. The bridge was constructed in 1934 and							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION LANGLEY AIR FORCE BASE, VIRGINIA		
4. PROJECT TITLE RESTORE KING STREET BRIDGE	5. PROJECT NUMBER MUHJ933001	
<p>has undergone no significant repairs since it was built. Traffic on the bridge has been progressively restricted since 1987 due to rapid, persistent deterioration of major components. Three engineering investigations have been conducted since 1987. These investigations confirm that deterioration is accelerating because of the age of the span and the highly corrosive salt water environment. A December 1991 investigation found that up to 35% of the deterioration has occurred since 1987. Base engineers have been forced to progressively reduce weight limits on the bridge from a 20-ton design limit to 14 tons and then 10 tons following 1987 and 1991 structural investigations. The Corps of Engineers has advised base officials that current restrictions will not provide a reliable margin of safety after December 1993. The following are examples of the major deterioration identified in engineering investigations: Sections of the concrete deck have extensive transverse cracks, many of which go completely through the deck; expansion joints in the deck are no longer functioning, and slabs adjacent to the joints have consequently received severe damage; this damage is accelerating, particularly at the ends of the span. The bridge superstructure is extensively damaged from wear and the corrosive environment; steel girders, flanges and rivets that attach the sole plates to the beams are badly rusted; (Continued below in ADDITIONAL)</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Critical access to Langley AFB will continue to be limited by vehicle weight restrictions. Ongoing deterioration will shortly result in closure of the bridge in order to avoid structural failure and possible loss of life. Closing the bridge would also result in unacceptable traffic impacts to the city of Hampton and would inconvenience bridge users by forcing them to drive 4.5 miles further to the next nearest entrance to the base.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> bridge stiffeners are also severely corroded, and in some areas have rusted away completely; this, in addition to severe girder corrosion, presents a concern for lateral stability and shear buckling resistance at the girder ends; concrete on the bottom surface of the deck is grossly spalled which presents a safety hazard to boaters crossing under the bridge and exposes reinforcing bars to corrosion.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																		
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION LANGLEY AIR FORCE BASE, VIRGINIA																				
4. PROJECT TITLE RESTORE KING STREET BRIDGE	5. PROJECT NUMBER MUHJ933001																			
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>91 OCT 10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>93 JAN 14</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 MAY 01</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <p>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</p> <p>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</p> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>240</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>170</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>410</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>300</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>110</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	91 OCT 10	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	93 JAN 14	(d) Date Design Complete	93 MAY 01	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	240	(b) All Other Design Costs	170	(c) Total	410	(d) Contract	300	(e) In-house	110
(a) Date Design Started	91 OCT 10																			
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																			
(c) Date 35% Designed	93 JAN 14																			
(d) Date Design Complete	93 MAY 01																			
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	240																			
(b) All Other Design Costs	170																			
(c) Total	410																			
(d) Contract	300																			
(e) In-house	110																			

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)							2. DATE		
AIR FORCE											
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION					4. COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX			
FAIRCHILD AIR FORCE BASE, WASHINGTON					AIR COMBAT COMMAND			1.00			
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			TOTAL
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	
a. As of 30 SEP 92		562	3570	495	140	372	22				5,161
b. End FY 1998		709	3923	576	140	372	22				5,742
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (6,060)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)											280,299
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:											34,960
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:											3,500
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)											9,300
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:											35,730
g. Remaining Deficiency:											0
h. Grand Total:											363,789
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE		SCOPE		COST (\$000)		DESIGN STATUS			
CODE								START		CMLP	
171-621		INTELLIGENCE TECHNICAL TRAINING FACILITY		14,400 SF		3,500		SEP 92		JUN 93	
						TOTAL:				3,500	
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995)											
218-712		ADD TO AND ALTER MUNITIONS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT SHOP/STORAGE		16,850 SF		1,400					
442-257		HAZARDOUS MATERIALS STORAGE FACILITY		7,000 SF		1,400					
610-243		SURVIVAL TRAINING SUPPORT COMPLEX		42,000 SF		5,000					
871-183		STORM DRAINAGE FACILITIES		LS		1,500					
						TOTAL:				9,300	
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
121-122		ADD TO HYDRANT FUELING SYSTEM		10 OL		4,200					
124-000		UPGRADE POL DIKES AND BASINS		LS		2,330					
131-111		COMMUNICATIONS FACILITY		18,000 SF		3,450					
214-425		LOGISTICS COMPLEX		22,200 SF		1,850					
822-265		UPGRADE STEAM DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM		LS		3,500					
10. Mission or Major Functions: A bomb wing which includes one B-52 squadron and a combat air rescue detachment with UH-1 helicopters; an Air Mobility Command air refueling group with two KC-135 squadrons; an Air National Guard air refueling wing (KC-135 aircraft); an Air Training Command combat crew training group (survival training school); and an Air Force Space Command satellite control squadron.											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:											0
b. Water pollution:											5,034
c. Occupational safety and health:											0
d. Other Environmental:											0

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION FAIRCHILD AIR FORCE BASE, WASHINGTON			4. PROJECT TITLE INTELLIGENCE TECHNICAL TRAINING FACILITY			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 9.12.12S	6. CATEGORY CODE 171-621	7. PROJECT NUMBER GJKZ920029	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 3,500			
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
INTELLIGENCE TECHNICAL TRAINING FACILITY		SF	14,400	160	2,304	
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					820	
UTILITIES		LS			(165)	
PAVEMENTS		LS			(105)	
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(80)	
DEMOLISH BUILDINGS		LS			(15)	
SECURITY UPGRADE REQUIREMENTS		LS			(455)	
SUBTOTAL					3,124	
CONTINGENCY (5%)					156	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					3,280	
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					197	
TOTAL REQUEST					3,477	
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					3,500	
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Masonry walls, concrete foundations and floor slabs, standing seam metal roof, utilities and other necessary support. Special security construction needed to meet Top Secret clearance requirements. Air Conditioning: 50 Tons.						
11. REQUIREMENT: 14,400 SF ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 4,196 SF PROJECT: Construct an intelligence technical training facility for the Special Survival Training Program (SSTP). (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: A major objective of HQ USAF is to increase the manning, course load, and number of students in the Special Survival Training Program and provide quality instruction for military and civilian members throughout DoD. A properly designed and furnished facility is essential to meet unique mission requirements and provide a quality learning environment to ensure adequacy of training in this complex, HQ USAF-directed, special training program. This facility should be located at Fairchild because courses taught in adjacent training facilities are prerequisites to the Special Survival Training Program. Collocation saves spending additional TDY travel funds for students. Furthermore, these facilities are to be shared with Air Training Command for special access exercises. The isolated location of these training facilities is considered by JCS to be critical to the security and effectiveness of their exercises. CURRENT SITUATION: The present academic facility originally was designed as a weapon assembly building. It is of Korean War vintage and located within a weapons storage area's Quantity Distance (QD) zone. Air Force regulations prohibit this type of facility in a QD zone, so any major addition is strongly discouraged. This building currently supports a						

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION FAIRCHILD AIR FORCE BASE, WASHINGTON		
4. PROJECT TITLE INTELLIGENCE TECHNICAL TRAINING FACILITY	5. PROJECT NUMBER GJKZ920029	
<p>full-time staff of 13 and an average of 15 students per week. Restroom facilities are shared by all male/female instructors and students. The instructor office area is one large room with partitions. These conditions have very direct, negative impacts on the research, study, and lesson preparation necessary for each instructor on a daily basis. Supervisors do not have adequate private areas to provide subordinate counseling. Vast amounts of research materials are scattered throughout the building, exemplifying the need for a dedicated library/research room. The future installation of a STU-111 (secure telephone) will necessitate a secure, private room for classified discussions. Because of the class sizes and differences in the classes taught, two small and two large classrooms are required. Only one classroom currently is available, and instructors must conduct two of their courses in the program via Mobile Training Team to locations worldwide. The SSTP presently is unable to provide resident training to the DoD community requiring this instruction. This places DoD and the US Government in a politically vulnerable position, prevents maintenance of optimum DoD readiness of operational forces, and directly affects capability to meet objectives.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Expansion to meet Joint Services, multi-course program requirements cannot be achieved without this facility. Additionally, to continue in the present facility means that instructor and student productivity will continue to be degraded. This project is in concert with the Air Training Command and Survival School Master Plan. If not approved, the Special Survival Training Program will remain at its present location, isolated from the necessary logistical support provided by the 3636 CCTW new survival complex, training facilities, billeting, administration, and supply.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There are no criteria for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide," or in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements."</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																																													
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION FAIRCHILD AIR FORCE BASE, WASHINGTON																																															
4. PROJECT TITLE INTELLIGENCE TECHNICAL TRAINING FACILITY	5. PROJECT NUMBER GJKZ920029																																														
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td colspan="3">(1) Status:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td></td> <td>92 SEP 30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td></td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td></td> <td>92 NOV 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td></td> <td>93 JUN 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(2) Basis:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td></td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td></td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td></td> <td>219</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td></td> <td>182</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td></td> <td>401</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> <td>267</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td></td> <td>134</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(4) Construction Start</td> <td></td> <td>93 DEC</td> </tr> </table> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(1) Status:			(a) Date Design Started		92 SEP 30	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%	(c) Date 35% Designed		92 NOV 01	(d) Date Design Complete		93 JUN 01	(2) Basis:			(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A	(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)			(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		219	(b) All Other Design Costs		182	(c) Total		401	(d) Contract		267	(e) In-house		134	(4) Construction Start		93 DEC
(1) Status:																																															
(a) Date Design Started		92 SEP 30																																													
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%																																													
(c) Date 35% Designed		92 NOV 01																																													
(d) Date Design Complete		93 JUN 01																																													
(2) Basis:																																															
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO																																													
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A																																													
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)																																															
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		219																																													
(b) All Other Design Costs		182																																													
(c) Total		401																																													
(d) Contract		267																																													
(e) In-house		134																																													
(4) Construction Start		93 DEC																																													

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)						2. DATE			
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION MCCHORD AIR FORCE BASE, WASHINGTON				4. COMMAND AIR MOBILITY COMMAND		5. AREA CONST COST INDEX 1.00					
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			TOTAL
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	
a. As of 30 SEP 92		514	3536	1194	2	45	27	2			5,320
b. End FY 1998		414	3555	1158	2	45	27	2			5,203
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (5,745)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)										187,188	
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:										2,540	
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:										10,900	
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)										15,350	
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:										18,770	
g. Remaining Deficiency:										0	
h. Grand Total:										234,748	
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE			SCOPE		COST (\$000)		DESIGN STATUS		
CODE									START		CMPL
721-312		ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES (DBOF)			259 PN		6,500		JUN 92		AUG 93
740-884		CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER COMPLEX (DBOF)			31,000 SF		4,400		MAY 92		DEC 93
TOTAL:							10,900				
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995)											
149-962		CONTROL TOWER			1 EA		2,650				
610-000		ADD TO AND ALTER CONSOLIDATED SUPPORT CENTER			67,940 SF		5,900				
721-312		ALTER DORMITORIES			280 PN		6,800				
TOTAL:							15,350				
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
219-000		BASE ENGINEERING COMPLEX			125,175 SF		8,600				
219-944		BASE MAINTENANCE SHOP			2,400 SF		470				
411-135		REPAIR JET FUEL STORAGE			LS		6,700				
411-135		IMPROVE JET FUEL STORAGE			LS		2,000				
610-243		GROUP HEADQUARTERS FACILITY			5,900 SF		1,000				
10. Mission or Major Functions: An airlift wing which includes three C-141 squadrons; an Air Force Reserve C-141 associate airlift wing; Air Combat Command Northwest Air Defense Sector; and an Air National Guard fighter interceptor detachment (F-15 aircraft).											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:										0	
b. Water pollution:										0	
c. Occupational safety and health:										0	
d. Other Environmental:										8,700	

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION MCCHORD AIR FORCE BASE, WASHINGTON				4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES (DBOF)		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 4.18.96		6. CATEGORY CODE 721-312	7. PROJECT NUMBER POWY933030		8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 6,500	
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES (DBOF)		SF	63,800		5,075	
ALTERATION		SF	49,600	82	(4,067)	
ADDITION (BALCONIES)		SF	14,200	71	(1,008)	
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					485	
UTILITIES		LS			(245)	
PAVEMENTS		LS			(120)	
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(120)	
SUBTOTAL					5,560	
CONTINGENCY (10%)					556	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					6,116	
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					367	
TOTAL REQUEST					6,483	
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					6,500	
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Upgrade existing facility and construct addition for balcony entrances. Includes room-bath-room configuration, insulation and sound attenuation, utilities and other necessary support.						
11. REQUIREMENT: 1,770 PN ADEQUATE: 918 PN SUBSTANDARD: 819 PN PROJECT: Add to and alter dormitories. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: A major Air Force objective provides unaccompanied enlisted personnel with housing conducive to their proper rest, relaxation and personal well-being. Properly designed and furnished quarters providing some degree of individual privacy are essential to the successful accomplishment of the increasingly complicated and important jobs these people must perform. CURRENT SITUATION: Existing unaccompanied personnel housing is far below current DOD standards. These dormitories have central latrines, inadequate control of heating, insufficient noise attenuation and lack the necessary amenities to adequately house enlisted personnel. This project will upgrade two facilities to meet current DOD standards and is phase three of a five-phase program to upgrade dorms at McChord. Current dormitory occupancy rate at McChord is 96 percent. IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: Substandard living conditions on base and expensive off-base housing will continue to be a contributing factor to low morale, reduced productivity and dissatisfaction with Air Force life for unaccompanied enlisted personnel. ADDITIONAL: This project meets the criteria/scope specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". A life-cycle economic analysis has been performed comparing all reasonable options for accomplishing this project (status quo, renovation and new						

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION MCCHORD AIR FORCE BASE, WASHINGTON		
4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER PQWY933030	
<p>construction). This analysis indicates renovation is the most economical. Project has been considered for FY97 force structure end strength.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																																													
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION MCCHORD AIR FORCE BASE, WASHINGTON																																															
4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER PQWY933030																																														
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td colspan="3">(1) Status:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td></td> <td>92 JUN 03</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td></td> <td>30%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td></td> <td>93 FEB 19</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td></td> <td>93 AUG 31</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(2) Basis:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td></td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td></td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td></td> <td>295</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td></td> <td>266</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td></td> <td>561</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> <td>393</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td></td> <td>168</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(4) Construction Start</td> <td></td> <td>94 MAR</td> </tr> </table> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(1) Status:			(a) Date Design Started		92 JUN 03	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		30%	(c) Date 35% Designed		93 FEB 19	(d) Date Design Complete		93 AUG 31	(2) Basis:			(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A	(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)			(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		295	(b) All Other Design Costs		266	(c) Total		561	(d) Contract		393	(e) In-house		168	(4) Construction Start		94 MAR
(1) Status:																																															
(a) Date Design Started		92 JUN 03																																													
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		30%																																													
(c) Date 35% Designed		93 FEB 19																																													
(d) Date Design Complete		93 AUG 31																																													
(2) Basis:																																															
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO																																													
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A																																													
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)																																															
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		295																																													
(b) All Other Design Costs		266																																													
(c) Total		561																																													
(d) Contract		393																																													
(e) In-house		168																																													
(4) Construction Start		94 MAR																																													

1. COMPONENT		FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)		2. DATE	
AIR FORCE					
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION			4. PROJECT TITLE		
MCCHORD AIR FORCE BASE, WASHINGTON			CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER COMPLEX (DBOF)		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT	6. CATEGORY CODE	7. PROJECT NUMBER	8. PROJECT COST(\$000)		
4.18.96	740-884	PQWY933011	4,400		
9. COST ESTIMATES					
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER COMPLEX (DBOF)		SF	33,400		3,282
CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER (A)		SF	16,000	100	(1,600)
CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER (B)		SF	15,000	100	(1,500)
MECHANICAL SUPPORT FACILITY		SF	2,400	76	(182)
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					650
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(155)
UTILITIES		LS			(295)
PAVEMENTS		LS			(160)
DEMOLITION/ASBESTOS REMOVAL		SF	3,200	13	(40)
SUBTOTAL					3,932
CONTINGENCY (5%)					197
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					4,129
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					248
TOTAL REQUEST					4,377
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					4,400
10. Description of Proposed Construction: All structural, electrical and mechanical work necessary to construct two child development center facilities. Includes classrooms, kitchen, multipurpose rooms, nurseries, administrative space, mechanical equipment room and necessary support. Air Conditioning: 40 Tons.					
11. REQUIREMENT: 50,550 SF ADEQUATE: 19,564 SF SUBSTANDARD: 3,200 SF PROJECT: Construct a child development center complex. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: A complex which provides adequate space and environment for child development requirements and an atmosphere conducive to the needs of young dependent children of assigned military and civilian personnel. McChord has a total of 674 children of military and civilian families eligible for day care. Current space criteria restricts the size of child development centers to accommodate only 305 children in one facility. In order to provide the required space to support eligible children at this installation, two facilities are needed. CURRENT SITUATION: The current facilities accommodate only 38 percent of the demand for child care. Changes in the make-up of the military and civilian population have increased the need for full-day child care development services. Single parents, dual working couples, and working spouses have changed the focus from a recreational support activity to a mission support program. Because more children stay at the center ten hours a day, five days a week, improved developmental care facilities must provide more adequate indoor and outdoor play space, learning centers, sleeping facilities and kitchen/food service areas. Expanded program requirements cannot be provided and the increased demand for child care cannot be met due to lack of space. Current waiting list for full-time day care is 384 children. Certified home care is available (35 homes care					

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION MCCHORD AIR FORCE BASE, WASHINGTON		
4. PROJECT TITLE CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER COMPLEX (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER PQWY933011	
<p>for 210 children); however, additional facilities are required. One substandard facility will be disposed of upon completion of this project.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Lack of quality and affordable child care contributes to employee absenteeism, low morale and has a negative impact on the military and civilian workforces.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> This project meets the criteria/scope specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". A life-cycle economic analysis has been performed comparing all reasonable options for accomplishing this project (status quo, renovation and new construction). This analysis indicates the new construction alternative is the most economical. Project has been considered for FY97 force structure end strength.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION MCCHORD AIR FORCE BASE, WASHINGTON																								
4. PROJECT TITLE CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER COMPLEX (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER PQWY933011																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="379 634 1428 768"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 MAY 29</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>15%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>93 JUL 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 DEC 04</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="379 832 1346 895"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="379 959 1428 1119"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>273</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>114</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>387</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>387</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 MAR</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 MAY 29	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	15%	(c) Date 35% Designed	93 JUL 15	(d) Date Design Complete	93 DEC 04	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	273	(b) All Other Design Costs	114	(c) Total	387	(d) Contract		(e) In-house	387
(a) Date Design Started	92 MAY 29																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	15%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	93 JUL 15																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 DEC 04																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	273																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	114																							
(c) Total	387																							
(d) Contract																								
(e) In-house	387																							

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)							2. DATE		
AIR FORCE											
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION					4. COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX			
F E WARREN AIR FORCE BASE, WYOMING					AIR COMBAT COMMAND			1.08			
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			TOTAL
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	
a. As of 30 SEP 92		559	3030	557							4,146
b. End FY 1998		546	2920	574							4,040
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (6,610)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)										214,988	
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:										10,750	
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:										12,640	
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)										1,700	
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:										5,000	
g. Remaining Deficiency:										0	
h. Grand Total:										245,073	
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE			SCOPE		COST (\$000)		DESIGN STATUS		
CODE									START CMPL		
130-835		RENOVATE SECURITY POLICE OPERATIONS			77,200 SF		6,000		NOV 92 DEC 93		
141-911		REMOTE MISSILE CREW FACILITIES			40,000 SF		3,800		NOV 92 JUL 93		
411-135		UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS PHASE I			34 EA		2,200		OCT 92 MAR 93		
851-147		WEAPONS STORAGE AREA SECURITY			LS		640		SEP 92 MAY 93		
							TOTAL:		12,640		
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995)											
411-000		UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS MISSILE FACILITIES			39 EA		1,700				
							TOTAL:		1,700		
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
610-000		UPGRADE 5 HISTORIC FACILITIES			42,321 SF		2,500				
610-112		LAW CENTER			11,500 SF		1,000				
871-183		STORM DRAINAGE FACILITIES			LS		1,500				
10. Mission or Major Functions: A missile wing consisting of one Peacekeeper and three Minuteman intercontinental ballistic missile squadrons which maintain a continuous alert posture, and a combat air rescue detachment with UH-1 helicopters.											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:										0	
b. Water pollution:										7,780	
c. Occupational safety and health:										0	
d. Other Environmental:										0	

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)				2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION F E WARREN AIR FORCE BASE, WYOMING				4. PROJECT TITLE RENOVATE SECURITY POLICE OPERATIONS			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 1.18.96C		6. CATEGORY CODE 130-835	7. PROJECT NUMBER GHLN941016		8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 6,000		
9. COST ESTIMATES							
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)		
RENOVATE SECURITY POLICE OPERATIONS		SF	77,000	57	4,389		
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					750		
UTILITIES		LS			(95)		
PAVEMENTS		LS			(60)		
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(95)		
DEMOLITION AND ASBESTOS REMOVAL		SF	50,000	10	(500)		
SUBTOTAL					5,139		
CONTINGENCY (10%)					514		
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					5,653		
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					339		
TOTAL REQUEST					5,992		
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					6,000		
10. Description of Proposed Construction: All structural, mechanical, electrical, and architectural work for renovation of Security Police Operations located in an historic building. Includes interior/exterior finishes, communications prewiring, prewired workstations, asbestos removal, site improvements, landscaping, utility service upgrades, and parking lot improvements. Air Conditioning: 300 Tons.							
11. REQUIREMENT: 77,200 SF ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 77,200 SF PROJECT: Renovate security police operations. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: Adequate facilities are required to provide space for the Security Police Group and four Security Police Squadrons responsible for security of missile fields located in four states, and strategic weapons storage and maintenance. Facilities must provide adequate space for all security police functions, including law enforcement, resource and personnel protection, and base information security functions plus detention, training, and customer service functions such as "Pass and Identification." A consolidated facility is necessary to optimize command and control, and the location of the existing facility provides for short response times to emergencies. CURRENT SITUATION: This building was constructed in 1909 as a post hospital. It is on the National Register of Historic Places and is included in the Historic Landmark District. The facility must be retained and preserved as long as it is so designated. The type of renovation is restricted by this historic designation; however, these restrictions would not prevent efficient use of the facility by the Security Police Group. While the building's interior layout may have been appropriate for a 1909 hospital, it is haphazard and inefficient for Security Police functions.							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION F E WARREN AIR FORCE BASE, WYOMING		
4. PROJECT TITLE RENOVATE SECURITY POLICE OPERATIONS	5. PROJECT NUMBER CHLN941016	
<p>There is no separation of customer service areas from law enforcement and security operations. For example, "Pass and Identification", which everyone assigned to the base must visit, is located in the center of the building, and customers must wait in a hallway used by armed Security Police. The entire facility is dilapidated. Some structural repairs are required to prevent further deterioration; floors are uneven due to structural members having shifted over the years. All windows and doors need replacing because of their age, as do some of the stone window sills and much of the exterior woodwork. The mechanical and electrical systems are outdated and undersized. Access to some of the key elements of these systems is restricted because the entire basement has been sealed off due to asbestos hazards. The building has the potential for many years of continued use if interior renovation is accomplished and repairs are made to the exterior to preserve the building.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Adequate facilities to house the Security Police will not be available. This historical building will become so deteriorated that it cannot be used for base functions and, new construction will be required to provide useable facilities. Due to the age and condition of this building, maintenance and repair costs are excessive, and with limited funding the building, will deteriorate from lack of maintenance unless a major renovation project is accomplished.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of new construction, renovation, and status quo operations. Based upon the net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, renovation was found to be the most cost efficient over the life of the project. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of the Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements".</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																		
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION F E WARREN AIR FORCE BASE, WYOMING																				
4. PROJECT TITLE RENOVATE SECURITY POLICE OPERATIONS	5. PROJECT NUMBER GHLN941016																			
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="404 625 1478 756"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 NOV 02</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 DEC 04</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 DEC 01</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <p>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</p> <p>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</p> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="404 940 1478 1102"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>150</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>210</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>360</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>300</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>60</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 MAR</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 NOV 02	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 DEC 04	(d) Date Design Complete	93 DEC 01	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	150	(b) All Other Design Costs	210	(c) Total	360	(d) Contract	300	(e) In-house	60
(a) Date Design Started	92 NOV 02																			
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																			
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 DEC 04																			
(d) Date Design Complete	93 DEC 01																			
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	150																			
(b) All Other Design Costs	210																			
(c) Total	360																			
(d) Contract	300																			
(e) In-house	60																			

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION F E WARREN AIR FORCE BASE, WYOMING			4. PROJECT TITLE REMOTE MISSILE CREW FACILITIES			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 1.18.96C		6. CATEGORY CODE 141-911	7. PROJECT NUMBER GHLN941017	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 3,800		
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
REMOTE MISSILE CREW FACILITIES		EA	4		2,960	
MISSILE CREW FACILITY (10000 SF EACH)		SF	40,000	74	(2,960)	
SUPPORTING FACILITIES			1		470	
UTILITIES		LS			(20)	
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(30)	
DEMOLITION		SF	28,400	13	(370)	
PAVEMENTS		LS			(50)	
SUBTOTAL					3,433	
CONTINGENCY (5%)					172	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					3,602	
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					216	
TOTAL REQUEST					3,818	
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					3,800	
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Two-story structure with concrete footings and foundation (use existing foundation if possible), masonry exterior walls, and a sloped metal roof. Includes demolition, site work, heated vehicle parking, fire protection, sleeping quarters, kitchen dining area, management offices, recreation rooms, hardened security observation room, mechanical rooms and all necessary support. Air Conditioning: 14 Tons.						
11. REQUIREMENT: 40,000 SF ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 28,400 SF PROJECT: Construct missile crew facilities (MCFs). (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: Provide operational facilities for missile launch crews, flight security crews, maintenance crews, and supporting ground crews at four Minuteman/Peacekeeper launch control centers to keep our ICBM force viable into the 21st century. These buildings provide sleeping quarters, recreational rooms, kitchen and dining facilities, study rooms, flight security control rooms, facility manager's rooms, mechanical and water treatment rooms, electric generator and equipment rooms, latrines and attached garages for snow removal, security and launch crew vehicles. Exterior requirements include utility upgrades and adequate paved parking. CURRENT SITUATION: The existing MCFs are over 28 years old and require constant repair. The buildings are in violation of fire codes. They are made of combustible materials such as light wood-frame construction and tar-based shingled roofs. The wiring is old and brittle and will not handle the increased amperage of modern day appliances and electronic equipment. From a recent survey, these facilities were also found to have significant structural/plumbing problems, contain asbestos, have inefficient and ineffective mechanical systems, and in general have out lived their economic life. From an operations standpoint, these						

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION F E WARREN AIR FORCE BASE, WYOMING		
4. PROJECT TITLE REMOTE MISSILE CREW FACILITIES	5. PROJECT NUMBER GHLN941017	
<p>facilities adversely impact mission effectiveness by constantly requiring maintenance. For example, replacement parts for the elevators are no longer manufactured, and only through the ingenuity of maintenance personnel do they operate at all.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Guided missile launch crews and primary support personnel will be forced to stay in substandard, aging and deteriorated facilities and will not be able to perform at peak efficiency. The MCFs are critical to launch capability and their importance can't be overlooked in the context of maintaining a modern, capable and secure ICBM force.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There is no scope/criteria for this project in Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide." All known alternative options were considered during the development of this project. No other option could meet the mission requirements; therefore, no economic analysis was needed or performed.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION F E WARREN AIR FORCE BASE, WYOMING																								
4. PROJECT TITLE REMOTE MISSILE CREW FACILITIES	5. PROJECT NUMBER GHLN941017																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="393 632 1468 762"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 NOV 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 DEC 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 JUL 10</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="393 825 1468 888"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="393 951 1468 1108"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>200</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>220</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>420</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>360</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>60</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 NOV 01	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 DEC 01	(d) Date Design Complete	93 JUL 10	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	200	(b) All Other Design Costs	220	(c) Total	420	(d) Contract	360	(e) In-house	60
(a) Date Design Started	92 NOV 01																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 DEC 01																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 JUL 10																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	200																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	220																							
(c) Total	420																							
(d) Contract	360																							
(e) In-house	60																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)				2. DATE		
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION F E WARREN AIR FORCE BASE, WYOMING				4. PROJECT TITLE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS PHASE I				
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 1.18.56C		6. CATEGORY CODE 411-135	7. PROJECT NUMBER GHLN952500		8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 2,200			
9. COST ESTIMATES								
ITEM					U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS PHASE I					EA	39		1,884
REPLACE UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANKS					EA	27	48,890	(1,320)
UPGRADE UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANKS					EA	12	47,000	(564)
SUBTOTAL								1,884
CONTINGENCY (10%)								188
TOTAL CONTRACT COST								2,072
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)								124
TOTAL REQUEST								2,126
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)								2,200
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Excavate/remove 27 underground storage tanks. Dispose of tank residue and test soil at each site. Remove/dispose of contaminated soil. Replace tanks with new double-walled tanks, interstitial leak detectors, double-wall piping and spill/overflow protectors. Upgrade 12 tanks with leak detectors, double-wall piping, corrosion, spill, overflow protection, and epoxy lining.								
11. REQUIREMENT: As required. <u>PROJECT:</u> Replace/upgrade underground storage tanks (USTs) at missile launch and launch control facilities. Phase 1 of 4. (Current Mission) <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> This is a Level II environmental compliance project. All regulated USTs must be upgraded in accordance with Federal Law (40 CFR 280.21) by December 1998. The Law also requires underground tanks have leak detection, corrosion protection and spill/overflow prevention systems to protect human health and the environment. <u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> Underground storage tanks at F E Warren AFB do not meet Federal regulatory requirements for corrosion protection, leak detection monitoring and overflow/spill protection. These deficiencies must be corrected to prevent violation of Federal UST regulations. Currently, 134 shallow buried USTs at missile launch and launch control facilities require upgrade or replacement to meet the 1998 Federal deadline. This project is the first of four phases, and will replace/upgrade 39 USTs. <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> These improvements to USTs are required by Federal Law. If they are not accomplished by the established deadline, the base will be in violation of the law and may begin receiving Notices of Violation, fines, and significant adverse publicity. Undetected tank failures may result in contamination of soil and potable water supplies.								

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION F E WARREN AIR FORCE BASE, WYOMING		
4. PROJECT TITLE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS PHASE I	5. PROJECT NUMBER GHLN952500	
<p>resulting in a threat to human health as well as extremely costly cleanup measures.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> A preliminary analysis of reasonable options for accomplishing this project was done. It indicates there is only one option that satisfies statutory requirements. Because of this, a full economic analysis was not performed. A certificate of exclusion has been prepared. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements".</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																																													
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION F E WARREN AIR FORCE BASE, WYOMING																																															
4. PROJECT TITLE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS PHASE I	5. PROJECT NUMBER GHLN952500																																														
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td colspan="3">(1) Status:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td></td> <td>92 OCT 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td></td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td></td> <td>92 DEC 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td></td> <td>93 MAR 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(2) Basis:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td></td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td></td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td></td> <td>78</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td></td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td></td> <td>88</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> <td>78</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td></td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(4) Construction Start</td> <td></td> <td>94 MAY</td> </tr> </table> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(1) Status:			(a) Date Design Started		92 OCT 01	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%	(c) Date 35% Designed		92 DEC 15	(d) Date Design Complete		93 MAR 15	(2) Basis:			(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A	(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)			(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		78	(b) All Other Design Costs		10	(c) Total		88	(d) Contract		78	(e) In-house		10	(4) Construction Start		94 MAY
(1) Status:																																															
(a) Date Design Started		92 OCT 01																																													
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%																																													
(c) Date 35% Designed		92 DEC 15																																													
(d) Date Design Complete		93 MAR 15																																													
(2) Basis:																																															
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO																																													
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A																																													
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)																																															
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		78																																													
(b) All Other Design Costs		10																																													
(c) Total		88																																													
(d) Contract		78																																													
(e) In-house		10																																													
(4) Construction Start		94 MAY																																													

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)						2. DATE			
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ANTIGUA AIR STATION, ANTIGUA ISLAND, WEST INDIES				4. COMMAND AIR FORCE SPACE COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX 1.73				
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			TOTAL
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	
a. As of 30 SEP 92		1	1								2
b. End FY 1998		1	1								2
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (274)									
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)										9,424	
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:										8,200	
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:										1,000	
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)										0	
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:										0	
g. Remaining Deficiency:										0	
h. Grand Total:										18,624	
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE			SCOPE		COST (\$000)		DESIGN STATUS		
CODE									START		CMPL
811-145		SLFI-UPGRADE BACKUP GENERATOR			1,000 KW		1,000		DEC 92		JUL 93
					TOTAL:		1,000				
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995) NONE											
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
10. Mission or Major Functions: A missile and satellite tracking station.											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:										1,500	
b. Water pollution:										0	
c. Occupational safety and health:										0	
d. Other Environmental:										0	

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)							2. DATE		
AIR FORCE											
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION					4. COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX			
ASCENSION ISLAND AUXILIARY AIRFIELD, SOUTH ATLANTIC OCEAN					AIR FORCE SPACE COMMAND			2.50			
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			TOTAL
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	
a. As of 30 SEP 92		1	1								2
b. End FY 1998		2	2								4
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (3,857)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)		31,166									
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:		22,000									
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:		3,400									
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)		0									
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:		7,100									
g. Remaining Deficiency:		0									
h. Grand Total:		63,666									
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE		SCOPE		COST (\$000)		DESIGN STATUS			
<u>CODE</u>								<u>START</u>		<u>CMP</u>	
831-165		WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT		LS		3,400		NOV 92		SEP 93	
				TOTAL:		3,400					
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995) NONE											
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
214-425		VEHICLE AND HEAVY EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE FACILITY		20,000 SF		3,500					
219-944		FACILITY MAINTENANCE BUILDING		15,000 SF		2,500					
371-475		GPS INSTRUMENTATION FACILITY		5,000 SF		1,100					
10. Mission or Major Functions: An Air Force Space Command down range missile and satellite tracking station supporting the Eastern Space and Missile Center.											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:		0									
b. Water pollution:		0									
c. Occupational safety and health:		0									
d. Other Environmental:		0									

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ASCENSION AUXILIARY AIRFIELD, ASCENSION ISLAND, SOUTH ATLANTIC OCEAN		4. PROJECT TITLE WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 3.58.56	6. CATEGORY CODE 831-165	7. PROJECT NUMBER YXTK963101	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 3,400	
9. COST ESTIMATES				
ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT	KG	80	8,700	696
SUPPORTING FACILITIES				2,205
SANITARY SEWER MAINS	LF	12,000	160	(1,920)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS	LS			(190)
START-UP TRAINING AND O&M TRAINING	LS			(95)
SUBTOTAL				2,901
CONTINGENCY (10%)				290
TOTAL CONTRACT COST				3,191
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6.5%)				207
TOTAL REQUEST				3,398
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)				3,400
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Provide and install an 80,000 gallon per day (GPD) corrosion resistant sewage treatment plant to treat saline effluent. Provide up to 180 days of operations and training. Includes all necessary foundation work, and all electrical and piping connections. Replace all 6" and 8" sewer mains.				
11. REQUIREMENT: 80 LS ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 0 <u>PROJECT:</u> Construct a package sewage treatment plant and replace sewer mains. (Current Mission) <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> This is a Level I environmental compliance requirement. DOD Directive 6050.16 requires that overseas installations comply with US EPA standards. An 80,000 gallon per day sewage treatment facility is required to properly treat and dispose of domestic and industrial wastewater. A distribution system of sewer laterals and mains is required to insure compliance and to safeguard personnel from potential health hazards resulting from leaks. <u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> This base has no treatment system to handle the domestic and industrial sewage. The base uses a series of septic tanks located throughout the main base area to collect the sewage and discharge it by free-flow outfall directly into the ocean. Raw discharge of this nature is unacceptable and will continue to pollute the surrounding environment. The existing cast iron and vitrified clay pipe sewer mains were installed over 30 years ago and have deteriorated to the point of failure, resulting in health hazards to personnel who live and work on Ascension. <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Septic tank effluents will continue to be discharged directly into the ocean, in violation of DOD policy. Continued deterioration of sewer mains will eventually lead to numerous failures.				

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ASCENSION AUXILIARY AIRFIELD, ASCENSION ISLAND, SOUTH ATLANTIC OCEAN		
4. PROJECT TITLE WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT	5. PROJECT NUMBER YXTK963101	
<p>Improper handling of sewage is unsanitary and unhealthy for people stationed at this remote location.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> All known alternative options were considered during the development of this project. No other option could meet the mission requirements; therefore, no economic analysis was needed or performed. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide".</p>		

1. COMPONENT	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
AIR FORCE		
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION		
ASCENSION AUXILIARY AIRFIELD, ASCENSION ISLAND, SOUTH ATLANTIC OCEAN		
4. PROJECT TITLE		5. PROJECT NUMBER
WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT		YXTK963101
12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:		
a. Estimated Design Data:		
(1) Status:		
(a) Date Design Started		92 NOV 06
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%
(c) Date 35% Designed		92 DEC 29
(d) Date Design Complete		93 SEP 01
(2) Basis:		
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)		
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		145
(b) All Other Design Costs		60
(c) Total		205
(d) Contract		175
(e) In-house		30
(4) Construction Start		93 DEC
b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)						2. DATE			
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION CLASSIFIED LOCATIONS (INSIDE AND OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES)						4. COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX 0.00		
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			TOTAL
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	
a. As of 30 SEP 92											
b. End FY 1998											
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (0)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)										0	
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:										0	
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:										13,640	
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)										44,200	
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:										119,800	
g. Remaining Deficiency:										0	
h. Grand Total:										177,640	
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE				SCOPE	COST (\$000)	DESIGN STATUS			
CODE							START	Cmpl			
100-000	SPECIAL TACTICAL UNIT DETACHMENT FACILITY				LS	5,540					
100-000	OMEGA FACILITIES				LS	2,600					
442-758	WAR READINESS MATERIEL WAREHOUSE				120,000 SF	5,500	MAY 90	SEP 93			
TOTAL:						13,640					
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995)											
100-000	SPECIAL TACTICAL UNIT DETACHMENT FACILITY				LS	2,140					
100-000	EUROPEAN GROUND STATION				LS	16,800					
100-000	VARIOUS FACILITIES				LS	2,060					
170-000	AIRCRAFT TRAINING FACILITIES				LS	2,000					
170-000	AIRCRAFT TRAINING FACILITIES				LS	5,200					
170-000	AIRCRAFT TRAINING FACILITIES				LS	2,100					
170-000	AIRCRAFT TRAINING FACILITIES				LS	9,600					
217-742	WAR READINESS MATERIEL MAINTENANCE/MANAGEMENT FAC				10,000 SF	1,300					
442-515	WAR READINESS MATERIEL MEDICAL STORAGE FACILITY				18,000 SF	1,800					
452-252	WAR READINESS MATERIEL OPEN STORAGE FACILITY				62,000 SF	1,200					
TOTAL:						44,200					
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:										0	
b. Water pollution:										0	
c. Occupational safety and health:										0	
d. Other Environmental:										0	

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION CLASSIFIED LOCATION				4. PROJECT TITLE WAR READINESS MATERIEL WAREHOUSE		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 2.80.31		6. CATEGORY CODE 442-758	7. PROJECT NUMBER HTAC943047		8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 5,500	
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
WAR READINESS MATERIEL WAREHOUSE		SF	120,000	39	4,680	
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					270	
UTILITIES		LS			(180)	
PAVEMENTS		LS			(50)	
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(40)	
SUBTOTAL					4,950	
CONTINGENCY (5%)					248	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					5,198	
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6.5%)					338	
TOTAL REQUEST					5,536	
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					5,500	
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Construct pre-engineered metal and masonry buildings with lighting, ventilation, other utility systems, and supporting facilities, including pavements and site improvements.						
11. REQUIREMENT: 120,000 SF ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 0 PROJECT: Construct a complex of war readiness materiel (WRM) storage warehouses. (New Mission) REQUIREMENT: Storage facilities are required for prepositioning and long-term storage of high-value WRM assets. These assets must be ready for use by US Central Command forces. CURRENT SITUATION: Other facilities in host country are unavailable for WRM storage requirements. WRM assets moved into the region during Operation DESERT SHIELD/DESERT STORM must either be stored in country or returned to the CONUS. CONUS storage and roundtrip transportation will exceed storage cost in host country. IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: Adequate facilities will not be available for storage of assets required to support US Central Command contingency planning in the Persian Gulf area. Without adequate storage facilities, increased transportation demands will greatly impede US capability to successfully execute contingency plans and protect national interests. ADDITIONAL: There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements".						

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION CLASSIFIED LOCATION																								
4. PROJECT TITLE WAR READINESS MATERIEL WAREHOUSE	5. PROJECT NUMBER HTAC943047																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="404 632 1478 762"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 MAY 18</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 AUG 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 SEP 15</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="404 827 1478 890"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="404 953 1478 1115"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>212</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>70</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>282</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>282</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 JAN</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 MAY 18	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 AUG 01	(d) Date Design Complete	93 SEP 15	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	212	(b) All Other Design Costs	70	(c) Total	282	(d) Contract		(e) In-house	282
(a) Date Design Started	92 MAY 18																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 AUG 01																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 SEP 15																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	212																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	70																							
(c) Total	282																							
(d) Contract																								
(e) In-house	282																							

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)							2. DATE		
AIR FORCE											
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION					4. COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX			
RAMSTEIN AIR BASE, GERMANY					UNITED STATES AIR FORCES IN EUROPE			1.40			
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			TOTAL
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	
a. As of 30 SEP 92		1256	6004	826							8,086
b. End FY 1998		1158	5591	785							7,534
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (677)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)		32,164									
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:		5,260									
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:		3,100									
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)		11,600									
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:		2,900									
g. Remaining Deficiency:		0									
h. Grand Total:		55,024									
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE		SCOPE		COST (\$000)		DESIGN STATUS			
<u>CODE</u>		<u>PROJECT TITLE</u>		<u>SCOPE</u>		<u>COST (\$000)</u>		<u>DESIGN STATUS</u>		<u>START</u> <u>CMPL</u>	
740-884		CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER		11,900 SF		3,100		JUN 92		MAY 93	
				TOTAL:		3,100					
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995)											
831-165		UPGRADE SEWAGE COLLECTION SYSTEM		LS		11,600					
				TOTAL:		11,600					
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
124-134		UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS		LS		2,900					
10. Mission or Major Functions: Headquarters United States Air Forces in Europe; a flying wing with two fighters squadrons (F-16 aircraft) and an airlift squadron (C-12, C-20, C-21, and T-43 aircraft, and UH-1 helicopters); a tactical intelligence wing; NATO's Headquarters Allied Air Forces Central Europe; an Air Force Intelligence Command intelligence wing; and an Air Mobility Command airlift support group. Also, the future beddown location of the aeromedical airlift mission (C-9 aircraft) from Rhein-Main AB, GE.											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:		0									
b. Water pollution:		2,900									
c. Occupational safety and health:		1,000									
d. Other Environmental:		0									

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)				2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION RAMSTEIN AIR BASE, GERMANY			4. PROJECT TITLE CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER				
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 2.75.96U		6. CATEGORY CODE 740-884	7. PROJECT NUMBER TYFR923006		8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 3,100		
9. COST ESTIMATES							
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)		
CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER		SF	11,900	190	2,261		
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					510		
UTILITIES		LS			(65)		
PAVEMENTS		LS			(270)		
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(155)		
COMMUNICATIONS SUPPORT		LS			(20)		
SUBTOTAL					2,771		
CONTINGENCY (5%)					139		
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					2,910		
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6.5%)					189		
TOTAL REQUEST					3,099		
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					3,100		
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Reinforced concrete foundation, floor slab and frame, masonry walls and structural roofing system. Functional areas include reception, multi-purpose room, restroom, storage, isolation room, offices, laundry, kitchen, mechanical room and playground. Includes fire protection, all utilities and necessary support, and demolition of interim facilities.							
11. REQUIREMENT: 73,465 SF ADEQUATE: 13,455 SF SUBSTANDARD: 39,005 SF PROJECT: Construct a child development center. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: Adequate facilities are required to support supervised care and developmental experience for dependent children aged six weeks to five years. The child development center must provide a comfortable, clean and educational environment for the dependent children of active duty military and DoD civilians stationed at this overseas location. CURRENT SITUATION: The Kaiserlautern Military Community (KMC) which includes Ramstein Air Base and the Vogelweh Annex receives child development services at both locations. The total requirement is based on the needs of the entire KMC. Since both areas are separated geographically and have respective housing areas, the services are provided at both locations. Deficiencies are being corrected by this project and a companion project at Vogelweh Annex. Currently, there is only one facility for child care at Ramstein Air Base. A second facility that had been used for child care was condemned by the Director of Air Force Child Development Youth Activities during a visit in July 1990 and was subsequently closed. Since this facility closed the waiting list for child care has grown to over 330 children. Of these, about 112 are going to licensed family day caregivers throughout the community. The rest are either going to unlicensed care providers or simply doing without. Two							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION RAMSTEIN AIR BASE, GERMANY		
4. PROJECT TITLE CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	5. PROJECT NUMBER TYFR923006	
<p>relocatable buildings will be moved from Zweibrucken Air Base to provide an interim solution to the shortfall of space, but a permanent solution is desperately needed. Adequate child care is much more difficult to obtain in Europe than in the States since there are no franchised child care centers on the economy. The problem gets even worse during exercises and emergencies when short notice, 24-hour care is required by many of our personnel.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Without adequate child care for the dependents of active duty military and DoD civilians at Ramstein morale and readiness will decline. Airmen who have the extra burden of worrying about the care of their children simply will not operate as effectively as those who know their families are being provided for.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> This project is not eligible for NATO funding. The NATO infrastructure program does not support child care facilities; however, a precautionary prefinance statement will be submitted in the event the project becomes eligible in the future. This project meets the criteria/scope specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide".</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION RAMSTEIN AIR BASE, GERMANY																								
4. PROJECT TITLE CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	5. PROJECT NUMBER TYFR923006																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 JUN 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 OCT 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 MAY 31</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>129</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>129</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>79</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>50</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 JUN 01	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	50%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 OCT 15	(d) Date Design Complete	93 MAY 31	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	129	(b) All Other Design Costs		(c) Total	129	(d) Contract	79	(e) In-house	50
(a) Date Design Started	92 JUN 01																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	50%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 OCT 15																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 MAY 31																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	129																							
(b) All Other Design Costs																								
(c) Total	129																							
(d) Contract	79																							
(e) In-house	50																							

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)							2. DATE		
AIR FORCE											
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION					4. COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX			
THULE AIR BASE, GREENLAND					AIR FORCE SPACE COMMAND			2.48			
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			TOTAL
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	
a. As of 30 SEP 92		24	108	3							135
b. End FY 1998		22	1009	3							1,034
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (234,022)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)											399,020
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:											12,700
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:											5,492
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)											2,150
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:											51,200
g. Remaining Deficiency:											0
h. Grand Total:											470,562
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY					COST		DESIGN STATUS				
CODE	PROJECT TITLE	SCOPE			(\$000)	START	Cmpl				
831-165	WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT	LS			5,492	AUG 92	SEP 93				
					TOTAL:	5,492					
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995)											
179-511 FIRE TRAINING FACILITY		LS			2,150						
					TOTAL:	2,150					
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
112-211	UPGRADE AIRFIELD PAVEMENTS, PHASE III	222,000 SY			8,900						
219-944	CONSOLIDATED CIVIL ENGINEERING SHOPS	36,100 SF			5,200						
721-312	RENOVATE UNACCOMPANIED ENLISTED HSG	58 PN			4,700						
721-315	ALTER DORMITORY	27,120 SF			5,800						
721-315	DORMITORY	150 PN			11,000						
10. Mission or Major Functions: A space warning group; a satellite tracking group; and a communications squadron.											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:											2,150
b. Water pollution:											1,200
c. Occupational safety and health:											0
d. Other Environmental:											0

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)		2. DATE	
AIR FORCE					
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION			4. PROJECT TITLE		
THULE AIR BASE, GREENLAND			WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT	6. CATEGORY CODE	7. PROJECT NUMBER	8. PROJECT COST(\$000)		
3.58.56	831-165	WWCX953004	5,492		
9. COST ESTIMATES					
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT		SF	14,400	330	4,752
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					130
UTILITIES		LS			(25)
COMMUNICATIONS SUPPORT		LS			(15)
OTHER SUPPORTING FACILITIES		LS			(40)
START-UP TRAINING AND O&M TRAINING		LS			(50)
SUBTOTAL					4,882
CONTINGENCY (5%)					244
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					5,126
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6.5%)					333
TOTAL REQUEST					5,459
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					5,492
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Construct a 14,400 SF pre-engineered steel building. Provide and install wastewater treatment equipment. Provide up to 180 days of operations and training.					
11. REQUIREMENT: 14,400 LS ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 0					
<u>PROJECT:</u> Construct a wastewater treatment plant. (Current Mission)					
<u>REQUIREMENT:</u> This is a Level I environmental compliance requirement. DoD Directive 6050.16 requires overseas installations to comply with US EPA standards. A 100,000 gallon/day treatment facility is required to treat domestic and industrial wastewater for the main base area of Thule AB, Greenland.					
<u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> Raw sewage from the main base area enters a network of aboveground sanitary lines. The untreated sewage then discharges into North Star Bay. The two satellite sites to the main base (Det 3 and BMEWS) discharge to the ground and will be addressed under separate O&M contracts.					
<u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Raw sewage will continue to discharge directly into North Star Bay, violating DoD directives.					
<u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". All known alternative options were considered during the development of this project. No other option could meet the mission requirements; therefore, no economic analysis was needed or performed.					

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION THULE AIR BASE, GREENLAND																								
4. PROJECT TITLE WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT	5. PROJECT NUMBER WWCX953004																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 AUG 10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 NOV 10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 SEP 01</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>336</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>224</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>560</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>448</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>112</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 AUG 10	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 NOV 10	(d) Date Design Complete	93 SEP 01	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	336	(b) All Other Design Costs	224	(c) Total	560	(d) Contract	448	(e) In-house	112
(a) Date Design Started	92 AUG 10																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 NOV 10																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 SEP 01																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	336																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	224																							
(c) Total	560																							
(d) Contract	448																							
(e) In-house	112																							

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)							2. DATE		
AIR FORCE											
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION					4. COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX			
ANDERSEN AIR FORCE BASE, GUAM					PACIFIC AIR FORCES			2.24			
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	TOTAL
a. As of 30 SEP 92		206	2271	561				21	25		3,084
b. End FY 1998		203	2167	588				21	25		3,004
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (15,971)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)											268,861
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:											15,690
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:											4,100
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)											23,696
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:											78,450
g. Remaining Deficiency:											0
h. Grand Total:											390,797
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE		SCOPE		COST (\$000)		DESIGN STATUS			
CODE								START		CMPL	
411-137		UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS		LS		4,100		SEP 92		AUG 93	
				TOTAL:		4,100					
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995)											
121-111		ADD TO AND ALTER PETROLEUM OPERATIONS FACILITY		4,150 SF		1,700					
130-835		ADD TO AND ALTER SECURITY POLICE OPERATIONS FACILITY		18,430 SF		3,650					
216-642		RENOVATE MUNITIONS MAINTENANCE FACILITIES		LS		4,296					
219-944		ENTOMOLOGY SHOP		2,500 SF		1,100					
411-135		UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS		LS		4,150					
724-417		UPGRADE TRANSIENT DORMITORIES		108 PN		8,800					
				TOTAL:		23,696					
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
219-944		CIVIL ENGINEERING COMPLEX		LS		9,000					
411-135		JET FUEL STORAGE		LS		4,150					
610-243		MISSION SUPPORT FACILITY		LS		5,000					
800-000		ECIP		LS		2,500					
841-165		INDUSTRIAL WASTE WATER TREATMENT FACILITY		200 KG		1,500					
10. Mission or Major Functions: Headquarters Thirteenth Air Force; an airlift support squadron which provides enroute and staging support to transient and deploying US aircraft; and a combat communications group.											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:											3,850
b. Water pollution:											15,800
c. Occupational safety and health:											0
d. Other Environmental:											0

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ANDERSEN AIR FORCE BASE, GUAM		4. PROJECT TITLE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 2.74.56	6. CATEGORY CODE 411-137	7. PROJECT NUMBER AJJY933105	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 4,100	
9. COST ESTIMATES				
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST (\$000)
UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS		LS		2,825
SUPPORTING FACILITIES				830
CONTAINMENT DIKES		LS		(60)
CATHODIC PROTECTION/DETECTION DEVICES		LS		(200)
EXCAVATION/BACKFILL		LS		(450)
SOIL TESTING/DISPOSAL		LS		(120)
SUBTOTAL				3,655
CONTINGENCY (5%)				183
TOTAL CONTRACT COST				3,838
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6.5%)				249
TOTAL REQUEST				4,087
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)				4,100
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Replaces and upgrades six (6) Underground Storage Tanks (UST). Includes old tank removal, installation of new tanks with release detection, encasement, spill and overflow prevention devices, cathodic protection, soil testing/disposal, site work, utilities and other necessary support.				
11. REQUIREMENT: As required. PROJECT: Replaces and upgrades six (6) underground fuel storage tanks. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: This is a Level II environmental compliance project. Upgrade of all USTs regulated by 40 CFR 280 and Guam Code 10 GCA 88 to new construction standards is required. The Federal and Guam Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA & GEPA) have set standards that require all regulated USTs to have leak detection, corrosion protection, and spill/overflow prevention systems by December 1998. If USTs are to be replaced, Air Force Policy is to replace them with aboveground tanks or to relocate them into underground vaults wherever possible. However, existing underground petroleum product storage tanks which are in good condition may be upgraded in place to bring them into compliance with applicable UST standards. CURRENT SITUATION: Andersen AFB has 38 USTs requiring replacement and upgrade. The tanks are made of steel, unlined and do not have cathodic protection. Eleven of these tanks will be removed or replaced by 1994. This project replaces the largest and oldest six (6) of the 27 tanks left. A FY95 MILCON project will address the remaining 21 tanks. The tanks in this project are 25-36 years old and do not have leak detection or prevention devices. The EPA's cause-of-release study found that unprotected steel tanks over 15 years of age represent the highest				

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ANDERSEN AIR FORCE BASE, GUAM		
4. PROJECT TITLE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	5. PROJECT NUMBER AJJY933105	
<p>potential leakage threat. Andersen AFB recently identified underground fuel tanks of the same construction and age which were leaking and had to be closed. This experience makes it probable that all tanks have been affected by the corrosive soil and lack of protection, and are liable to leak at any time. Guam EPA has recently adopted stringent regulations which require all tanks be replaced or upgraded because of the porous coral-based soil and the location of Andersen AFB over the island's main water aquifer.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Failure to take corrective action will result in underground storage tanks which do not meet regulatory requirements. After 22 December 1998, the US Air Force would be open to GEPA Notice of Violations and monetary penalties with possible litigation forcing compliance and remediation. The potential for soil/groundwater contamination would remain and is highly likely based on previous experience at Andersen AFB with tanks of this age.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements". A preliminary analysis of reasonable options for accomplishing this project (status quo, repair and replacement construction) was done. It indicates there is only one option that satisfies statutory requirements. Because of this, a full economic analysis was not performed. A certificate of exclusion has been prepared.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																																													
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ANDERSEN AIR FORCE BASE, GUAM																																															
4. PROJECT TITLE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	5. PROJECT NUMBER AJJY933105																																														
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <table data-bbox="343 612 1468 1187"> <tr> <td colspan="3">(1) Status:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td></td> <td>92 SEP 25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td></td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td></td> <td>92 OCT 08</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td></td> <td>93 AUG 16</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(2) Basis:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td></td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td></td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td></td> <td>247</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td></td> <td>156</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td></td> <td>403</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> <td>346</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td></td> <td>57</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(4) Constructor Start</td> <td></td> <td>93 NOV</td> </tr> </table> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(1) Status:			(a) Date Design Started		92 SEP 25	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%	(c) Date 35% Designed		92 OCT 08	(d) Date Design Complete		93 AUG 16	(2) Basis:			(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A	(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)			(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		247	(b) All Other Design Costs		156	(c) Total		403	(d) Contract		346	(e) In-house		57	(4) Constructor Start		93 NOV
(1) Status:																																															
(a) Date Design Started		92 SEP 25																																													
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%																																													
(c) Date 35% Designed		92 OCT 08																																													
(d) Date Design Complete		93 AUG 16																																													
(2) Basis:																																															
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO																																													
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A																																													
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)																																															
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		247																																													
(b) All Other Design Costs		156																																													
(c) Total		403																																													
(d) Contract		346																																													
(e) In-house		57																																													
(4) Constructor Start		93 NOV																																													

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)						2. DATE			
AIR FORCE											
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION						4. COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX		
DIEGO GARCIA AIR BASE, INDIAN OCEAN						PACIFIC AIR FORCES			3.00		
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			TOTAL
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	
a. As of 30 SEP 92		4	19								23
b. End FY 1998		4	50								54
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (0)											0
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)											0
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:											0
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:											2,260
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)											0
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:											0
g. Remaining Deficiency:											0
h. Grand Total:											2,260
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE		SCOPE		COST (\$000)		DESIGN START		STATUS CMPL	
131-132	GPS INSTRUMENTATION FACILITY	3,100	SF	1,700	NOV 92	SEP 93					
219-946	SATELLITE TRACKING STORAGE FACILITY	1,000	SF	560	NOV 92	SEP 93					
						TOTAL:	2,260				
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995) NONE											
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
10. Mission or Major Functions: A logistics group detachment; Air Force Space Command satellite tracking and space surveillance detachments; and an Air Mobility Command airlift support detachment.											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:											0
b. Water pollution:											0
c. Occupational safety and health:											0
d. Other Environmental:											0

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
AIR FORCE						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION				4. PROJECT TITLE		
DIEGO GARCIA AIR BASE, INDIAN OCEAN				GPS INSTRUMENTATION FACILITY		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT		6. CATEGORY CODE	7. PROJECT NUMBER		8. PROJECT COST(\$000)	
3.59.96		131-132	FGDA943001		1,700	
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
GPS INSTRUMENTATION FACILITY		SF	3,700	300	1,110	
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					430	
UTILITIES		LS			(80)	
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(35)	
UPGRADE EMERGENCY GENERATOR		LS			(140)	
DEMOLITION		LS			(25)	
SECURITY PROVISIONS		LS			(150)	
SUBTOTAL					1,540	
CONTINGENCY (5%)					77	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					1,617	
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6.5%)					105	
TOTAL REQUEST					1,722	
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					1,700	
EQUIPMENT FROM OTHER APPROPRIATIONS (NON-ADD)					(500)	
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Permanent concrete masonry unit (CMU) structure with structural steel/built-up roof, slab-on-grade foundation, gypsum wall board and suspended ceiling, raised computer flooring, temperature and humidity controlled environment (heating not required) and emergency generator. Air Conditioning: 20 Tons.						
11. REQUIREMENT: 3,720 SF ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 1,408 SF <u>PROJECT:</u> Construct Global Positioning System (GPS) Instrumentation Facility. (Current Mission) <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> Provide an environmentally controlled facility to house secure electronic equipment (worth over \$2.0M) necessary to provide telemetry, tracking, and command (TT&C) data for satellites in the Global Positioning System (GPS) constellation. The GPS requires three strategically located ground stations for worldwide coverage of its 21 satellite constellation which provides DOD, other government agencies and commercial users with state-of-the-art navigation data. The ground stations are located on Ascension Island, Diego Garcia, and Kwajalein Atoll. Each site provides required coverage for a portion of GPS satellite orbits above its sector of the earth. Hence, each ground station must be fully operational 24 hours per day to provide telemetry, tracking, and control (TT&C) support to each satellite. <u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> The GPS ground station at Diego Garcia is comprised of secure communications equipment located within a congested Navy Communications Station, and non-secure transmission equipment located in a small metal trailer adjacent to the ground antenna. The secure equipment facility has inadequate operations and storage space and limited access due to Navy communications security requirements. The facility is located						

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION DIEGO GARCIA AIR BASE, INDIAN OCEAN		
4. PROJECT TITLE GPS INSTRUMENTATION FACILITY	5. PROJECT NUMBER FGDA943001	
<p>approximately one mile from the main operations area. Technicians must travel between these two locations when troubleshooting or initializing equipment. The non-secure equipment trailer is severely deteriorated due to the extremely corrosive marine environment and now leaks when it rains. There is inadequate space to conduct routine maintenance on equipment (technicians must open the main door and stand outside the trailer to access some racks). The only latrine facility on site is a chemical toilet and the technicians use a shipping container for office space. Storage space is so limited that many of the technical supplies are housed in the ground antenna radome.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Valuable electronic equipment used to control GPS vehicles and transmit mission data will continue to be housed in inadequate facilities which hamper the ability to perform the mission. Depending on the timing of the failure and the health status of satellites operated by the particular site, this could result in the loss of crucial TT&C/navigation data, or the possibility of a multi-million dollar satellite receiving inadequate instructions. Improper management of satellites can result in errors in the data received by users on the ground worldwide.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements".</p>		

1. COMPONENT	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)		2. DATE
AIR FORCE			
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION			
DIEGO GARCIA AIR BASE, INDIAN OCEAN			
4. PROJECT TITLE		5. PROJECT NUMBER	
GPS INSTRUMENTATION FACILITY		FGDA943001	
12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:			
a. Estimated Design Data:			
(1) Status:			
(a) Date Design Started		92 NOV 09	
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%	
(c) Date 35% Designed		92 DEC 30	
(d) Date Design Complete		93 SEP 01	
(2) Basis:			
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO	
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A	
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e):			(\$000)
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications			100
(b) All Other Design Costs			50
(c) Total			150
(d) Contract			125
(e) In-house			25
(4) Construction Start			93 DEC
b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations:			
EQUIPMENT NOMENCLATURE	PROCURING APPROPRIATION	FISCAL YEAR APPROPRIATED OR REQUESTED	COST (\$000)
UPS	3080	1994	500

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)							2. DATE		
AIR FORCE											
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION					4. COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX			
THUMRAIT AIR BASE, OMAN					AIR COMBAT COMMAND			1.58			
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			TOTAL
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	
a. As of 30 SEP 92											
b. End FY 1998											
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (0)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)										0	
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:										25,800	
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:										1,800	
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)										0	
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:										0	
g. Remaining Deficiency:										0	
h. Grand Total:										27,660	
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE				SCOPE		COST (\$000)		DESIGN STATUS	
CODE										START Cmpl	
442-628		WAR READINESS MATERIEL COVERED STORAGE FACILITY				60,000 SF		1,800		MAY 92 JUL 93	
							TOTAL:		1,800		
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995) NONE											
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
10. Mission or Major Functions: A contingency operating location with pre-positioned wartime assets.											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:										0	
b. Water pollution:										0	
c. Occupational safety and health:										0	
d. Other Environmental:										0	

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE			
AIR FORCE								
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION				4. PROJECT TITLE				
THUMRAIT AIR BASE, OMAN				WAR READINESS MATERIEL COVERED STORAGE FACILITY				
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT		6. CATEGORY CODE	7. PROJECT NUMBER		8. PROJECT COST(\$000)			
2.80.31		442-628	HTAC943044		1,800			
9. COST ESTIMATES								
ITEM					U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
WAR READINESS MATERIEL COVERED STORAGE FACILITY					SF	60,000	20	1,200
SUPPORTING FACILITIES								410
UTILITIES					LS			(60)
PAVEMENTS					LS			(250)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS					LS			(100)
SUBTOTAL								1,610
CONTINGENCY (5%)								81
TOTAL CONTRACT COST								1,691
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6.5%)								110
TOTAL REQUEST								1,801
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)								1,800
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Construct pre-engineered metal storage sheds with required supporting facilities, including asphalt and concrete pavements, fencing, and utility systems.								
11. REQUIREMENT: 60,000 SF ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 0 PROJECT: Construct a war readiness materiel (WRM) covered storage shed and enclosure. (New Mission) REQUIREMENT: US Central Command requires repositioning of WRM assets in the command's area of responsibility. Covered storage shed facilities are required for repositioning and long-term storage of material and equipment which will deteriorate under continued direct exposure to sun and rain. These assets must be ready for use by US Central Command forces. CURRENT SITUATION: Other facilities in host country are unavailable for WRM storage requirements. Assets moved into the region during Operation DESERT SHIELD/DESERT STORM must either be stored in country or returned to the CONUS. CONUS storage costs and roundtrip transportation will exceed storage costs in host country. IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: Adequate facilities will not be available for storage of assets required to support US Central Command contingency planning in the Persian Gulf area. Without adequate storage facilities, increased transportation demands will greatly impede US capability to successfully execute contingency plans and protect national interests. ADDITIONAL: There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements".								

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																																													
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION THUMRAIT AIR BASE, OMAN																																															
4. PROJECT TITLE WAR READINESS MATERIEL COVERED STORAGE FACILITY	5. PROJECT NUMBER HTAC943044																																														
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td colspan="3">(1) Status:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td></td> <td>92 MAY 18</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td></td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td></td> <td>92 AUG 03</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td></td> <td>93 JUL 21</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(2) Basis:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td></td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td></td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td></td> <td>84</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td></td> <td>27</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td></td> <td>111</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td></td> <td>111</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(4) Construction Start</td> <td></td> <td>93 DEC</td> </tr> </table> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(1) Status:			(a) Date Design Started		92 MAY 18	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%	(c) Date 35% Designed		92 AUG 03	(d) Date Design Complete		93 JUL 21	(2) Basis:			(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A	(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)			(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		84	(b) All Other Design Costs		27	(c) Total		111	(d) Contract			(e) In-house		111	(4) Construction Start		93 DEC
(1) Status:																																															
(a) Date Design Started		92 MAY 18																																													
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%																																													
(c) Date 35% Designed		92 AUG 03																																													
(d) Date Design Complete		93 JUL 21																																													
(2) Basis:																																															
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO																																													
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A																																													
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)																																															
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		84																																													
(b) All Other Design Costs		27																																													
(c) Total		111																																													
(d) Contract																																															
(e) In-house		111																																													
(4) Construction Start		93 DEC																																													

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)							2. DATE			
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION INCIRLIK AIR BASE, TURKEY					4. COMMAND UNITED STATES AIR FORCES IN EUROPE			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX 0.95			
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			TOTAL
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	
a. As of 30 SEP 92		95	1891	124	107	494		3	30	4	2,748
b. End FY 1998		207	1983	130	107	494		3	30	4	2,958
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (3,471)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)											204,179
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:											1,100
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:											2,400
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)											0
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:											1,250
g. Remaining Deficiency:											0
h. Grand Total:											208,929
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE		SCOPE		COST (\$000)		DESIGN STATUS			
CODE								START	Cmpl		
721-312	ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES			280 PN		2,400		DEC 92	NOV 93		
						TOTAL:		2,400			
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995) NONE											
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
121-111		PETROLEUM OPERATIONS COMPLEX			LS		1,250				
10. Mission or Major Functions: Responsible for regional logistics in Turkey; a tactical group providing command and control for deployed fighter units; and an Air Mobility Command airlift support squadron. Also, home of a composite wing (provisional) with various types of aircraft.											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:											0
b. Water pollution:											1,200
c. Occupational safety and health:											0
d. Other Environmental:											0

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION INCIRLIK AIR BASE, TURKEY				4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 2.75.96U		6. CATEGORY CODE 721-312	7. PROJECT NUMBER LJYC923002		8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 2,400	
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES (280 PN)		SF	56,500		1,837	
ADDITION		SF	6,000	20	(120)	
ALTERATION		SF	50,500	34	(1,717)	
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					195	
UTILITIES		LS			(145)	
PAVEMENTS		LS			(15)	
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(35)	
SUBTOTAL					2,032	
CONTINGENCY (10%)					203	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					2,235	
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6.5%)					145	
TOTAL REQUEST					2,380	
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					2,400	
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Alter existing facilities to provide room-bath-room configuration and construct balconies to provide exterior entrances. Project includes insulation, sound attenuation, energy conservation features, fire protection, utilities and necessary support. Air Conditioning: 160 Tons. Grade Mix: 280 E1-E4.						
11. REQUIREMENT: 1,797 PN ADEQUATE: 1,144 PN SUBSTANDARD: 617 PN PROJECT: Add to and alter two dormitories. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: A major Air Force objective is to provide unaccompanied enlisted personnel with housing that will be conducive to their proper rest, relaxation and personal well-being. Properly designed and furnished quarters which provide some degree of individual privacy are essential to the successful accomplishment of the increasingly complicated and important jobs that our enlisted people must perform. CURRENT SITUATION: The existing facilities are 30-35 years old. They have central latrines, inadequate lighting, poor insulation and sound attenuation, and obsolete electrical and mechanical systems. Currently, these facilities are being used as transient dormitories in conjunction with Operation Provide Comfort (OPC). The high traffic caused by OPC has accelerated the wear on already worn facilities. The current average occupancy rate for dormitories is 96 percent with 206 enlisted personnel struggling to get by off base. There is no Overseas Housing Allowance (OHA) for Turkey; therefore, affordable off-base quarters for enlisted personnel do not have adequate communications and security or reliable power and water service, and usually are in undesirable locations. Permanent party personnel occupying the dormitories before project start-up will be given basic allowance for quarters (BAQ) during the						

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION INCIRLIK AIR BASE, TURKEY		
4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES	5. PROJECT NUMBER LJYC923002	
<p>alteration period.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> 280 enlisted troops will continue to stay in dormitories which degrade their morale, productivity, and career satisfaction.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> This project is not eligible for NATO funding. This type of facility is not within an established NATO infrastructure category for common funding and will most likely continue to be a user responsibility; however, a precautionary prefinance statement will be submitted in the event the project becomes eligible in the future. An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of new construction, revitalization, direct compensation, and status quo operation. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, revitalization was found to be the most cost-effective over the life of the project. This project meets the criteria/scope specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide".</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION INCIRLIK AIR BASE, TURKEY																								
4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES	5. PROJECT NUMBER LJYC923002																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="379 630 1468 766"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 DEC 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>93 JAN 61</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 NOV 15</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="379 819 1468 892"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="379 945 1468 1113"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>228</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>198</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>426</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>247</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>179</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 APR</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 DEC 15	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	93 JAN 61	(d) Date Design Complete	93 NOV 15	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	228	(b) All Other Design Costs	198	(c) Total	426	(d) Contract	247	(e) In-house	179
(a) Date Design Started	92 DEC 15																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	93 JAN 61																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 NOV 15																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	228																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	198																							
(c) Total	426																							
(d) Contract	247																							
(e) In-house	179																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)							2. DATE		
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ROYAL AIR FORCE MILDENHALL, UNITED KINGDOM					4. COMMAND UNITED STATES AIR FORCES IN EUROPE			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX 1.40			
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			TOTAL
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	
a. As of 30 SEP 92		303	2710	178	158	284	10	16	25	6	3,690
b. End FY 1998		292	2679	173	158	284	10	16	25	6	3,643
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (1,144)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)											98,189
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:											0
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:											4,800
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)											14,100
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:											0
g. Remaining Deficiency:											0
h. Grand Total:											117,089
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE		SCOPE		COST (\$000)		DESIGN STATUS			
<u>CODE</u>								<u>START</u>		<u>CMPL</u>	
211-152		NAVAL AIR FACILITY		28,000 SF		4,800		MAR 93		JAN 94	
				TOTAL:		4,800					
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995)											
141-753		DUAL SQUADRON OPERATIONS FACILITY		24,000 SF		5,500					
217-712		AVIONICS MAINTENANCE SHOP		6,000 SF		1,100					
610-142		TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT FACILITY		11,000 SF		1,900					
721-312		ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORY		25,308 SF		3,000					
721-312		ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORY		21,784 SF		2,600					
				TOTAL:		14,100					
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
10. Mission or Major Functions: Headquarters Third Air Force; an air refueling wing with one KC-135 squadron; a communications wing; and an Air Mobility Command airlift group.											
11. Outstanding pollution and safety (OSH) deficiencies:											
a. Air pollution:											0
b. Water pollution:											0
c. Occupational safety and health:											0
d. Other Environmental:											0

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE			
AIR FORCE								
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION				4. PROJECT TITLE				
ROYAL AIR FORCE MILDENHALL, UNITED KINGDOM				NAVAL AIR FACILITY				
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT		6. CATEGORY CODE	7. PROJECT NUMBER		8. PROJECT COST(\$000)			
2.75.96U		211-152	QFQE943006		4,800			
9. COST ESTIMATES								
ITEM					U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
NAVAL AIR FACILITY					SF	28,000	125	3,500
SUPPORTING FACILITIES								1,020
UTILITIES					LS			(455)
PAVEMENTS					LS			(210)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS					LS			(100)
FIRE PROTECTION MAINS					LS			(70)
COMMUNICATIONS SUPPORT					LS			(70)
SECONDARY CONSTRUCTION (BLDG 538)					SF	57,000	2	(115)
SUBTOTAL								4,520
CONTINGENCY (5%)								226
TOTAL CONTRACT COST								4,746
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (2.5%)								119
TOTAL REQUEST								4,865
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)								4,800
10. Description of Proposed Construction: A hangar including necessary administrative, storage, and work space. Work also includes minor modifications to a current hangar (Bldg 538) for relocation purposes. Provide required electrical, mechanical, and communications support. Provide required security and fire protection.								
11. REQUIREMENT: As required. PROJECT: Construct a hangar for general purpose aircraft maintenance. REQUIREMENT: See classified DD Form 1391.								

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ROYAL AIR FORCE MILDENHALL, UNITED KINGDOM																								
4. PROJECT TITLE NAVAL AIR FACILITY	5. PROJECT NUMBER QFQE943006																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="403 634 1460 764"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>93 MAR 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>93 AUG 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>94 JAN 01</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="403 827 1377 890"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="403 953 1460 1108"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>265</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>265</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>265</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 MAY</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	93 MAR 15	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	2	(c) Date 35% Designed	93 AUG 15	(d) Date Design Complete	94 JAN 01	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	265	(b) All Other Design Costs		(c) Total	265	(d) Contract	265	(e) In-house	
(a) Date Design Started	93 MAR 15																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	2																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	93 AUG 15																							
(d) Date Design Complete	94 JAN 01																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	265																							
(b) All Other Design Costs																								
(c) Total	265																							
(d) Contract	265																							
(e) In-house																								

1 COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 19 <u>94</u> MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM							2 DATE		
3 INSTALLATION AND LOCATION VARIOUS LOCATIONS					4 COMMAND			5 AREA CONSTR COST INDEX		
6 PERSONNEL STRENGTH a. AS OF b. END FY 19	PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			TOTAL
	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	
7 INVENTORY DATA (\$000)										
a. TOTAL ACREAGE										
b. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF										
c. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY										
d. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM										
e. AUTHORIZATION INCLUDED IN FOLLOWING PROGRAM										
f. PLANNED IN NEXT THREE PROGRAM YEARS										
g. REMAINING DEFICIENCY										
h. GRAND TOTAL										
B. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM.										
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE				COST		DESIGN STATUS		
CODE					SCOPE	(\$000)	START	COMPLETE		
010-211	Planning & Design				LS	63,180				

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)		2. DATE	
AIR FORCE					
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION			4. PROJECT TITLE		
VARIOUS LOCATIONS			PLANNING & DESIGN		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT	6. CATEGORY CODE	7. PROJECT NUMBER	8. PROJECT COST(\$000)		
9.12.11D	010-211	PAY2944016	63,180		
9. COST ESTIMATES					
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
PLANNING AND DESIGN		LS			63,180
SUBTOTAL					63,180
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					63,180
TOTAL REQUEST					63,180
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					63,180
10. Description of Proposed Construction: The funds requested will be used to provide financing for architectural and engineering services and construction design for Air Force Military Construction Programs.					
11. REQUIREMENT: As required. <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> These planning and design funds are required to complete the design of facilities in the FY 95 Military Construction Program, initiate design of facilities in the FY 96 Military Construction Program and accomplish planning and design for major and complex technical projects with a long lead-time to be included in subsequent Military Construction Programs. Also provides funds for value engineering and for the support of construction management activities of projects that are funded by foreign governments and for design of classified and special programs.					

1 COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 19 <u>94</u> MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	2 DATE								
3 INSTALLATION AND LOCATION VARIOUS LOCATIONS		4 COMMAND								
		5 AREA CONSTR COST INDEX								
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH: a. AS OF b. END FY 19	PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			TOTAL
	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	OFFICER	ENLISTED	CIVILIAN	
7 INVENTORY DATA (\$000)										
a. TOTAL ACREAGE b. INVENTORY TOTAL AS OF c. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY d. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM e. AUTHORIZATION INCLUDED IN FOLLOWING PROGRAM f. PLANNED IN NEXT THREE PROGRAM YEARS g. REMAINING DEFICIENCY h. GRAND TOTAL										
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM.										
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE		SCOPE		COST (\$000)		DESIGN STATUS		
CODE			SCOPE			START	COMPLETE			
010-211	Minor Construction (Unspecified)		LS			6,844				
•										

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
AIR FORCE						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION				4. PROJECT TITLE		
VARIOUS LOCATIONS				UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT		6. CATEGORY CODE	7. PROJECT NUMBER	8. PROJECT COST(\$000)		
9.12.11M		010-211	PAYZ924015B	6,844		
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM				U/M	QUANTITY	COST (\$000)
UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION				LS		6,844
SUBTOTAL						6,844
TOTAL CONTRACT COST						6,844
TOTAL REQUEST						6,844
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)						6,844
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Provide a lump sum amount for unspecified construction projects, not otherwise authorized by law, having a funded cost between \$300,000 and \$1,500,000, including construction, alteration or conversion of permanent or temporary facilities, in accordance with 10 USC 2805.						
11. REQUIREMENT: As required. <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> This package provides the means of accomplishing urgent projects that are not identified but which are anticipated to arise during FY 94. Included would be projects to support new mission requirements, support of new equipment and concepts and other essential support to Air Force missions and functions that could not wait until availability of FY 95 Military Construction Program funds. 10 USC 2805 provides authority to the Secretaries of the military departments to accomplish projects of this nature.						

DEFENSE ACCESS ROADS

1 COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA			2 DATE	
3 INSTALLATION AND LOCATION VARIOUS LOCATIONS			4 PROJECT TITLE ACCESS ROADS			
5 PROGRAM ELEMENT 1.11.27		6 CATEGORY CODE 851-147	7 PROJECT NUMBER		8 PROJECT COST (\$000) 7,150	
9 COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM			U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
ACCESS ROADS			LS			7,150
<p>10 DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION Finance construction of: (1) new off-station entrances for Air Force activities or new connections between Air Force activities; (2) urgently needed improvements of existing highways serving activities; (3) Federal Government's share of cost of relocating highways served by expansion or construction of new Air Force facilities; (4) alterations to roads near Air Force activities to accommodate special military vehicles; and (5) contractor damage to roads servicing missile bases. Funds provided will be transferred to the Federal Highway Administration of the Department of Transportation which is responsible for assuring proper execution of the work under Title 23 U.S. Code 210.</p> <p>11. REQUIREMENT: As Required.</p> <p>These funds are required to provide access roads under authorization contained in Title 23 U.S. Code 210, as amended. Access road items are required for construction, improvements, replacement or relocation of public highways necessitated by construction of new or expansion of existing Air Force activities which result in a sudden and significant impact on the adjacent highway system. Such items are also vital for relocation of highways to satisfy airway-highway or explosive-clearance criteria. Highways located within the boundaries of a military reservation are not eligible for financing from these funds. Projects in the regular Federal Aid Primary Systems are not normally considered eligible for financing with these funds (exceptions may occur for bases such as special vehicles, weapons safety, or other extraordinary impact generated by Air Force requirements.</p>						

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
AIR FORCE						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION				4. PROJECT TITLE		
WHITEMAN AIR FORCE BASE, MISSOURI				B-2 DEFENSE ACCESS ROADS		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT		6. CATEGORY CODE	7. PROJECT NUMBER	8. PROJECT COST(\$000)		
1.11.27		851-147	YWHG939302	7,150		
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
B-2 DEFENSE ACCESS ROADS		LS			5,395	
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					1,010	
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(555)	
PAVEMENTS		LS			(455)	
SUBTOTAL					6,405	
CONTINGENCY (5%)					320	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					6,725	
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					404	
TOTAL REQUEST					7,129	
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					7,150	
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Demolish existing pavements, reconstruct a wider road with adequate subbase and asphalt pavement. Includes concrete curbs, storm drains, street and traffic lighting. Relocate buried utilities and stripe roads.						
11. REQUIREMENT: As required. <u>PROJECT:</u> Construct defense access roads. (New Mission) <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> Provide required safe access to the base gates on the west side of the base from State Highway 23 and US Highway 50, via a diamond interchange and connector to State route 132. This is the last phase of a multi-phase effort. <u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> FY 91 B-2 MILCON funds constructed bridges, installed roadway subbase in areas of Highway 50/23/Route 132 connector and upgraded subbase and pavement on existing route 132. However, these public access roads to the base are still inadequate for any increased traffic volume. Although the preceding work improved the condition of the existing roads to Whiteman AFB, it did not increase the volume of traffic they could safely accommodate. After a defense access road "needs" report submittal to the Military Traffic Management Command (MTMC, US Army) for review, validation and coordination with federal, state, and local transportation agencies, MTMC determined that widening Route 132 from the base to Route 50, constructing an interchange at the intersection of Routes 132, 23 and 50, and realigning State Route 23 are all needed to handle traffic volume. All are eligible for federal funding. <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Public access roads, US Highway 50, State Highway 23 and State Route 132 leading to and from the base, will remain inadequate to handle traffic volume. Without these improvements, significant traffic hazards will go unabated. Excess volume on the						

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION WHITEMAN AIR FORCE BASE, MISSOURI		
4. PROJECT TITLE B-2 DEFENSE ACCESS ROADS	5. PROJECT NUMBER YWHG939302	
<p>existing roads will make driving unsafe as will traffic entering arterial Highway 50 from a perpendicular secondary state road.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> A preliminary analysis of reasonable options for accomplishing this project was done. It indicates there is only one option that will meet operational requirements. Consequently, a full economic analysis was not performed. A certificate of exclusion has been prepared. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide," nor in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements."</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																																													
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION WHITEMAN AIR FORCE BASE, MISSOURI																																															
4. PROJECT TITLE B-2 DEFENSE ACCESS ROADS	5. PROJECT NUMBER YWHG939302																																														
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td colspan="3">(1) Status:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td></td> <td>92 MAY 06</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td></td> <td>65%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td></td> <td>92 SEP 20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td></td> <td>93 JUL 30</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(2) Basis:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td></td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td></td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td></td> <td>300</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td></td> <td>100</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td></td> <td>400</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td></td> <td>400</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(4) Construction Start</td> <td></td> <td>94 MAR</td> </tr> </table> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(1) Status:			(a) Date Design Started		92 MAY 06	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		65%	(c) Date 35% Designed		92 SEP 20	(d) Date Design Complete		93 JUL 30	(2) Basis:			(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A	(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)			(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		300	(b) All Other Design Costs		100	(c) Total		400	(d) Contract			(e) In-house		400	(4) Construction Start		94 MAR
(1) Status:																																															
(a) Date Design Started		92 MAY 06																																													
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		65%																																													
(c) Date 35% Designed		92 SEP 20																																													
(d) Date Design Complete		93 JUL 30																																													
(2) Basis:																																															
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO																																													
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A																																													
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)																																															
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		300																																													
(b) All Other Design Costs		100																																													
(c) Total		400																																													
(d) Contract																																															
(e) In-house		400																																													
(4) Construction Start		94 MAR																																													

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)		2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION			4. PROJECT TITLE		
VARIOUS			PROJECTS \$1 MILLION AND UNDER		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT	6. CATEGORY CODE	7. PROJECT NUMBER	8. PROJECT COST(\$000)		
9. COST ESTIMATES					
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
<p>10. Description of Porposed Construction: Following are individual justification paragraphs for all projects \$1 million and under.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">VARIOUS LOCATIONS - WITHIN THE UNITED STATES VARIOUS LOCATIONS - OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES</p>					

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE												
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION VARIOUS LOCATIONS - WITHIN THE UNITED STATES														
4. PROJECT TITLE PROJECTS \$1 MILLION AND UNDER	5. PROJECT NUMBER													
<table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="244 517 541 549"><u>STATE AND LOCATION</u></th> <th data-bbox="745 517 959 549"><u>PROJECT TITLE</u></th> <th data-bbox="1339 480 1438 549"><u>COST (\$000)</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="3" data-bbox="244 580 365 612"><u>ALABAMA</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="277 644 637 740">GUNTER ANNEX ANX (AUN) JUBJ943087 442-257</td> <td data-bbox="745 644 1199 704">HAZARDOUS WASTE ACCUMULATION FACILITY</td> <td data-bbox="1372 644 1425 672">310</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3" data-bbox="244 772 1438 1123"> <p>Construct a hazardous waste accumulation facility. (Current Mission) A facility is required with proper environmental controls to accumulate hazardous materials. These materials include, but are not limited to: hazardous paints, thinners, acids, solvents, flammables, gas cylinders, and various grease and oils. The facility must have fire protection and spill prevention systems. There is no existing hazardous waste accumulation facility on Gunter that meets the life safety or environmental requirements. Currently wastes are staged at the satellite point, in violation of current regulations. The base will continue to function in violation of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) and will be subject to Notice of Violations and fines.</p> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			<u>STATE AND LOCATION</u>	<u>PROJECT TITLE</u>	<u>COST (\$000)</u>	<u>ALABAMA</u>			GUNTER ANNEX ANX (AUN) JUBJ943087 442-257	HAZARDOUS WASTE ACCUMULATION FACILITY	310	<p>Construct a hazardous waste accumulation facility. (Current Mission) A facility is required with proper environmental controls to accumulate hazardous materials. These materials include, but are not limited to: hazardous paints, thinners, acids, solvents, flammables, gas cylinders, and various grease and oils. The facility must have fire protection and spill prevention systems. There is no existing hazardous waste accumulation facility on Gunter that meets the life safety or environmental requirements. Currently wastes are staged at the satellite point, in violation of current regulations. The base will continue to function in violation of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) and will be subject to Notice of Violations and fines.</p>		
<u>STATE AND LOCATION</u>	<u>PROJECT TITLE</u>	<u>COST (\$000)</u>												
<u>ALABAMA</u>														
GUNTER ANNEX ANX (AUN) JUBJ943087 442-257	HAZARDOUS WASTE ACCUMULATION FACILITY	310												
<p>Construct a hazardous waste accumulation facility. (Current Mission) A facility is required with proper environmental controls to accumulate hazardous materials. These materials include, but are not limited to: hazardous paints, thinners, acids, solvents, flammables, gas cylinders, and various grease and oils. The facility must have fire protection and spill prevention systems. There is no existing hazardous waste accumulation facility on Gunter that meets the life safety or environmental requirements. Currently wastes are staged at the satellite point, in violation of current regulations. The base will continue to function in violation of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) and will be subject to Notice of Violations and fines.</p>														

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																																													
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION MAXWELL AIR FORCE BASE, GUNTER ANNEX, ALABAMA																																															
4. PROJECT TITLE HAZARDOUS WASTE ACCUMULATION FACILITY	5. PROJECT NUMBER JUBJ943087																																														
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td colspan="3">(1) Status:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td></td> <td>92 OCT 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td></td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td></td> <td>92 NOV 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td></td> <td>93 MAY 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(2) Basis:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td></td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td></td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td></td> <td>18</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td></td> <td>34</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td></td> <td>52</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td></td> <td>52</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(4) Construction Start</td> <td></td> <td>93 DEC</td> </tr> </table> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(1) Status:			(a) Date Design Started		92 OCT 01	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%	(c) Date 35% Designed		92 NOV 01	(d) Date Design Complete		93 MAY 01	(2) Basis:			(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A	(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)			(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		18	(b) All Other Design Costs		34	(c) Total		52	(d) Contract			(e) In-house		52	(4) Construction Start		93 DEC
(1) Status:																																															
(a) Date Design Started		92 OCT 01																																													
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%																																													
(c) Date 35% Designed		92 NOV 01																																													
(d) Date Design Complete		93 MAY 01																																													
(2) Basis:																																															
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO																																													
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A																																													
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)																																															
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		18																																													
(b) All Other Design Costs		34																																													
(c) Total		52																																													
(d) Contract																																															
(e) In-house		52																																													
(4) Construction Start		93 DEC																																													

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE												
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION VARIOUS LOCATIONS - WITHIN THE UNITED STATES														
4. PROJECT TITLE PROJECTS \$1 MILLION AND UNDER	5. PROJECT NUMBER													
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="237 517 531 544"><u>STATE AND LOCATION</u></th> <th data-bbox="740 517 948 544"><u>PROJECT TITLE</u></th> <th data-bbox="1334 480 1430 544"><u>COST (\$000)</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="3" data-bbox="237 583 356 610"><u>ALABAMA</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="270 644 624 736">GUNTER ANNEX ANX (AUN) JUBJ943091 831-000</td> <td data-bbox="740 644 1153 672">SPILL CONTAINMENT CONTROLS</td> <td data-bbox="1364 644 1414 672">470</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3" data-bbox="237 772 1430 1251"> <p>Provide structures to contain spills and prevent the discharge of pollutants into the waters of the United States. (Current Mission) This is a Level I environmental compliance project. The Clean Water Act requires measures to prevent the discharge of pollutants into the waters of the United States. Oil water separators are required on vehicle and equipment washing facilities. Rainfall runoff cannot enter the sanitary sewer through base facilities. The base cannot ensure containment of a spill within its boundaries. Clean up would take place in a tributary of the Alabama River or in a public park. The base is in violation of the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit. Vehicle and equipment washing facilities and building floor drains discharge directly to storm water drainage system without oil water separators. Gunter will continue to be in violation of the Clean Water Act and the NPDES permit. A spill into the sanitary sewer would contaminate a publicly owned treatment facility.</p> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			<u>STATE AND LOCATION</u>	<u>PROJECT TITLE</u>	<u>COST (\$000)</u>	<u>ALABAMA</u>			GUNTER ANNEX ANX (AUN) JUBJ943091 831-000	SPILL CONTAINMENT CONTROLS	470	<p>Provide structures to contain spills and prevent the discharge of pollutants into the waters of the United States. (Current Mission) This is a Level I environmental compliance project. The Clean Water Act requires measures to prevent the discharge of pollutants into the waters of the United States. Oil water separators are required on vehicle and equipment washing facilities. Rainfall runoff cannot enter the sanitary sewer through base facilities. The base cannot ensure containment of a spill within its boundaries. Clean up would take place in a tributary of the Alabama River or in a public park. The base is in violation of the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit. Vehicle and equipment washing facilities and building floor drains discharge directly to storm water drainage system without oil water separators. Gunter will continue to be in violation of the Clean Water Act and the NPDES permit. A spill into the sanitary sewer would contaminate a publicly owned treatment facility.</p>		
<u>STATE AND LOCATION</u>	<u>PROJECT TITLE</u>	<u>COST (\$000)</u>												
<u>ALABAMA</u>														
GUNTER ANNEX ANX (AUN) JUBJ943091 831-000	SPILL CONTAINMENT CONTROLS	470												
<p>Provide structures to contain spills and prevent the discharge of pollutants into the waters of the United States. (Current Mission) This is a Level I environmental compliance project. The Clean Water Act requires measures to prevent the discharge of pollutants into the waters of the United States. Oil water separators are required on vehicle and equipment washing facilities. Rainfall runoff cannot enter the sanitary sewer through base facilities. The base cannot ensure containment of a spill within its boundaries. Clean up would take place in a tributary of the Alabama River or in a public park. The base is in violation of the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit. Vehicle and equipment washing facilities and building floor drains discharge directly to storm water drainage system without oil water separators. Gunter will continue to be in violation of the Clean Water Act and the NPDES permit. A spill into the sanitary sewer would contaminate a publicly owned treatment facility.</p>														

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION MAXWELL AIR FORCE BASE, GUNTER ANNEX, ALABAMA																								
4. PROJECT TITLE SPILL CONTAINMENT CONTROLS	5. PROJECT NUMBER JUBJ943091																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="413 630 1470 766"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 OCT 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 NOV 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 MAY 01</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="413 819 1387 892"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="413 945 1470 1113"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>28</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>51</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>79</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>79</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 OCT 01	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 NOV 01	(d) Date Design Complete	93 MAY 01	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	28	(b) All Other Design Costs	51	(c) Total	79	(d) Contract		(e) In-house	79
(a) Date Design Started	92 OCT 01																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 NOV 01																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 MAY 01																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	28																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	51																							
(c) Total	79																							
(d) Contract																								
(e) In-house	79																							

1. COMPONENT	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
AIR FORCE		

3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION
 VARIOUS LOCATIONS - WITHIN THE UNITED STATES

4. PROJECT TITLE	5. PROJECT NUMBER
PROJECTS \$1 MILLION AND UNDER	

<u>STATE AND LOCATION</u>	<u>PROJECT TITLE</u>	<u>COST (\$000)</u>
<u>ALABAMA</u>		
MAXWELL AFB (AUN) PNQS943090 831-000	SPILL CONTAINMENT CONTROLS	970
<p>Provide structures to contain spills and prevent the discharge of pollutants into the waters of the United States. (Current Mission) The Clean Water Act requires measures to prevent the discharge of pollutants into the waters of the United States. Oil/water separators are required on vehicle and equipment washing facilities. Rainfall runoff must be prevented from entering the sanitary sewer through base facilities. The base cannot ensure containment of a spill within its boundaries, posing a serious contamination risk for the Alabama River and a tributary next to a major public road. The base is currently in violation of the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. Vehicle and equipment washing facilities and building floor drains discharge directly into the storm water drainage system without oil/water separators. Maxwell will continue to be in violation of the Clean Water Act and the NPDES permit. A spill into the sanitary sewer will contaminate a publicly owned treatment plant. The base spilled 4,500 gallons of heating fuel into the sanitary sewer in 1989 and was issued NOV's which required the pumping, transporting, storing and disposing of 70,000 gallons of contaminated sanitary sewage.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION MAXWELL AIR FORCE BASE, ALABAMA																								
4. PROJECT TITLE SPILL CONTAINMENT CONTROLS	5. PROJECT NUMBER PNQS943090																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="393 632 1468 762"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 OCT 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 NOV 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 MAY 01</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="393 825 1468 888"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="393 951 1468 1108"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>58</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>72</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>130</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>130</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 OCT 01	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 NOV 01	(d) Date Design Complete	93 MAY 01	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	58	(b) All Other Design Costs	72	(c) Total	130	(d) Contract		(e) In-house	130
(a) Date Design Started	92 OCT 01																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 NOV 01																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 MAY 01																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	58																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	72																							
(c) Total	130																							
(d) Contract																								
(e) In-house	130																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
---------------------------	--	---------

3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION
VARIOUS LOCATIONS - WITHIN THE UNITED STATES

4. PROJECT TITLE PROJECTS \$1 MILLION AND UNDER	5. PROJECT NUMBER
--	-------------------

<u>STATE AND LOCATION</u>	<u>PROJECT TITLE</u>	<u>COST (\$000)</u>
<u>ARIZONA</u>		
DAVIS-MONTHAN AFB (ACC) FBNV943007 411-135	UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	650
<p>Remove/replace underground storage tanks (USTs). (Current Mission) This is a level II environmental compliance project. Adequate fuel storage, properly designed and located, is required to satisfy base mission requirements. All petroleum dispensing and operating facilities must be provided with a means for detecting and preventing release of pollutants into the surrounding environment. All USTs must be upgraded in accordance with federal law (40 CFR 280.21) by December 1998. This includes leak detection, corrosion protection, and spill/overflow prevention systems to protect human health and the environment. Underground storage tanks at Davis-Monthan AFB do not meet federal requirements for corrosion protection, secondary containment, and overfill/spill protection. The condition of these tanks varies with a majority of the tanks at or exceeding their design life. These deficiencies must be corrected to prevent violation of federal UST regulations. If underground storage tanks require replacement, Air Force policy is to replace them with aboveground tanks or relocate them into underground vaults, whenever possible. Undetected UST releases can result in contamination of soil and ground water supplies, resulting in a threat to human health and the environment along with extremely costly cleanup measures. These improvements to USTs are mandated by federal law. If not accomplished by the established deadline, the base will be in violation of the law and subject to receiving Notices of Violation, fines and significant adverse publicity. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements".</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION DAVIS-MONTHAN AIR FORCE BASE, ARIZONA																								
4. PROJECT TITLE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	5. PROJECT NUMBER FBNV943007																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="379 630 1437 766"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 NOV 02</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 NOV 30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 AUG 01</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="379 829 1354 892"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="379 955 1437 1113"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>40</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 FEB</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 NOV 02	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 NOV 30	(d) Date Design Complete	93 AUG 01	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	30	(b) All Other Design Costs	10	(c) Total	40	(d) Contract		(e) In-house	40
(a) Date Design Started	92 NOV 02																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 NOV 30																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 AUG 01																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	30																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	10																							
(c) Total	40																							
(d) Contract																								
(e) In-house	40																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION VARIOUS LOCATIONS - WITHIN THE UNITED STATES		
4. PROJECT TITLE PROJECTS \$1 MILLION AND UNDER	5. PROJECT NUMBER	
<u>STATE AND LOCATION</u> <u>ARIZONA</u> LUKE AFB (ACC) NUEX943004 179-511	<u>PROJECT TITLE</u> FIRE TRAINING FACILITY	<u>COST</u> <u>(\$000)</u> 800
<p>Construct a fire training facility. (Current Mission) This is a Level I environmental compliance project. A live fire training facility meeting all environmental and safety regulations. Live fire training exercises, an FAA quarterly requirement, enable fire fighters to maintain a high level of proficiency in extinguishing two types of live fires: mass fuel spills and three dimensional (running fuel) fires. These exercises, performed on mock-ups typical of the mission assigned aircraft, have historically created compliance problems with the Clean Water Act. An impermeable lining below the pit area is required to prevent groundwater from becoming contaminated by residual unburned fuel. The existing facility does not have high-density polyethylene flexible liners and nets, a leak detection system, or spill containment capability. Continued use of the existing facility and site is prohibited due to non-compliance with State and Federal environmental regulations. Fire training at the current site was discontinued in September 1991. Required live fire training exercises cannot be conducted. The current site is an Installation Restoration Program site on the National Priority List. The existing facility was built in 1973 and includes an aircraft mock-up, a smoke house, a drafting pit, fire hydrant, and a fuel storage tank. The mock-up is located in a shallow, gravel-covered earthen pit without a protective liner which provides no protection to the surrounding soil and ground water. The existing fire training facility will remain out of compliance with State and Federal environmental laws. Firefighter proficiency will not be maintained. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". An Economic Analysis is not required for this project.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																																													
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION LUKE AIR FORCE BASE, ARIZONA																																															
4. PROJECT TITLE FIRE TRAINING FACILITY	5. PROJECT NUMBER NUEX943004																																														
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td colspan="3">(1) Status:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td></td> <td>92 JUL 22</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td></td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td></td> <td>92 JUL 30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td></td> <td>93 JUN 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(2) Basis:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td></td> <td>YES</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td></td> <td>44</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td></td> <td>62</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td></td> <td>106</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> <td>44</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td></td> <td>62</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(4) Construction Start</td> <td></td> <td>93 DEC</td> </tr> </table> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(1) Status:			(a) Date Design Started		92 JUL 22	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%	(c) Date 35% Designed		92 JUL 30	(d) Date Design Complete		93 JUN 01	(2) Basis:			(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		YES	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -			(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)			(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		44	(b) All Other Design Costs		62	(c) Total		106	(d) Contract		44	(e) In-house		62	(4) Construction Start		93 DEC
(1) Status:																																															
(a) Date Design Started		92 JUL 22																																													
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%																																													
(c) Date 35% Designed		92 JUL 30																																													
(d) Date Design Complete		93 JUN 01																																													
(2) Basis:																																															
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		YES																																													
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -																																															
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)																																															
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		44																																													
(b) All Other Design Costs		62																																													
(c) Total		106																																													
(d) Contract		44																																													
(e) In-house		62																																													
(4) Construction Start		93 DEC																																													

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION VARIOUS LOCATIONS - WITHIN THE UNITED STATES		
4. PROJECT TITLE PROJECTS \$1 MILLION AND UNDER	5. PROJECT NUMBER	
<u>STATE AND LOCATION</u> <u>COLORADO</u> USAF ACADEMY (AFA) XQPZ940031 411-135	<u>PROJECT TITLE</u> UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	<u>COST</u> <u>(\$000)</u> 780
<p>Remove and replace nine underground storage tanks. (Current Mission) This is a Level II environmental compliance project to upgrade by replacement underground storage tanks (other than those exempted and deferred by the Code of Federal Regulations, Title 40, Part 280) to new construction standards by December 1998. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has set standards that require all underground tanks to have leak detection, corrosion protection, and spill/ overflow prevention systems. Air Force policy is to replace underground tanks with aboveground tanks where operational constraints do not dictate otherwise. This project will bring the Air Force Academy into compliance with established Federal and state regulations governing underground storage tanks. The majority of the USTs at the Air Force Academy are approaching the end of their design lives and are in need of replacement. All nine tanks are out of compliance with the 1998 EPA standards. Many of the single-walled tanks are located in extremely permeable soil with ground water within 10 feet of the tank, and any leak would have serious contamination potential. The existing tanks require annual tightness testing, daily fluid level monitoring, and monthly inventory reconciliation and control because they lack the proper continuous monitoring equipment. If these tanks are not replaced, the risk of environmental damage is increased. Failure to bring the USTs into environmental compliance will result in the Air Force Academy receiving a Notice of Violation (NOV) from the regulators. This will ultimately result in fines and unfavorable publicity for the Air Force. All tanks must meet regulations or be permanently closed. There are no criteria for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide." However, this project does meet the criteria specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements."</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY, COLORADO																								
4. PROJECT TITLE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	5. PROJECT NUMBER XQPZ940031																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="388 640 1445 766"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 APR 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 MAY ii</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 DEC 01</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="388 829 1362 892"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="388 955 1445 1113"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>47</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>59</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>106</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>70</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>36</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 APR</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 APR 01	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 MAY ii	(d) Date Design Complete	93 DEC 01	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	47	(b) All Other Design Costs	59	(c) Total	106	(d) Contract	70	(e) In-house	36
(a) Date Design Started	92 APR 01																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 MAY ii																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 DEC 01																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	47																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	59																							
(c) Total	106																							
(d) Contract	70																							
(e) In-house	36																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE												
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION VARIOUS LOCATIONS - WITHIN THE UNITED STATES														
4. PROJECT TITLE PROJECTS \$1 MILLION AND UNDER	5. PROJECT NUMBER													
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="186 472 690 535"><u>STATE AND LOCATION</u></th> <th data-bbox="690 472 1274 535"><u>PROJECT TITLE</u></th> <th data-bbox="1274 472 1437 535"><u>COST (\$000)</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="3" data-bbox="186 556 1437 598"><u>DELAWARE</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="186 619 690 724">DOVER AFB (AMC) FJXT943002 211-159</td> <td data-bbox="690 619 1274 724">INSTALL EMISSION CONTROL DEVICES</td> <td data-bbox="1274 619 1437 724">860</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3" data-bbox="186 745 1437 1963"> <p>Install emission control devices. (Current Mission) This is a Level II environmental compliance project. Project is required to attain and maintain compliance with federal law and applicable regulations limiting the exhaust of volatile organic compounds (VOC). This legislation requires that Dover AFB use Maximum Available Control Technology (MACT) to reduce emissions of hazardous air pollutants by more than 90%. Dover currently produces 321 tons of VOC per year and must reduce these emissions to 32.1 tons per year. This project will enable Dover AFB to reduce VOC emissions at fuel transfer/storage locations, coating and cleaning operations and incinerator facilities. The base has contracted a firm to study air emissions on Dover. It evaluated liquid fuels and de-icer storage and transfer, stationary fuel burning sources, 40 industrial shops, three incinerators and mobile sources to include aircraft and vehicles. The study has determined that Dover AFB is a major stationary source of air emissions per federal Prevention of Serious Deterioration (PSD) Regulations, contained in 40 CFR 52.21. The study recommends that no major modifications be made to base boilers or liquid fuel operations without a PSD permit or reduction of emissions or both. The State of Delaware has been included within an interstate ozone implementation of Reasonable Available Control Technology (RACT) to reduce VOC emissions. Dover AFB does not meet the statutory requirements of the Clean Air Act Amendments (CAAA) of 1990. When the regulations are enacted in 1992, the base will be out of compliance. Non-compliance with the VOC/AIR emission statutes would subject Dover AFB to the potential for notices of violation, compliance orders and fines. Regulators could shut-down the liquid fuel, deicing or industrial shops which would shut-down flying operations. There is no criterial/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, Standard Facility Requirements". Project has been considered for FY97 force structure end strength.</p> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			<u>STATE AND LOCATION</u>	<u>PROJECT TITLE</u>	<u>COST (\$000)</u>	<u>DELAWARE</u>			DOVER AFB (AMC) FJXT943002 211-159	INSTALL EMISSION CONTROL DEVICES	860	<p>Install emission control devices. (Current Mission) This is a Level II environmental compliance project. Project is required to attain and maintain compliance with federal law and applicable regulations limiting the exhaust of volatile organic compounds (VOC). This legislation requires that Dover AFB use Maximum Available Control Technology (MACT) to reduce emissions of hazardous air pollutants by more than 90%. Dover currently produces 321 tons of VOC per year and must reduce these emissions to 32.1 tons per year. This project will enable Dover AFB to reduce VOC emissions at fuel transfer/storage locations, coating and cleaning operations and incinerator facilities. The base has contracted a firm to study air emissions on Dover. It evaluated liquid fuels and de-icer storage and transfer, stationary fuel burning sources, 40 industrial shops, three incinerators and mobile sources to include aircraft and vehicles. The study has determined that Dover AFB is a major stationary source of air emissions per federal Prevention of Serious Deterioration (PSD) Regulations, contained in 40 CFR 52.21. The study recommends that no major modifications be made to base boilers or liquid fuel operations without a PSD permit or reduction of emissions or both. The State of Delaware has been included within an interstate ozone implementation of Reasonable Available Control Technology (RACT) to reduce VOC emissions. Dover AFB does not meet the statutory requirements of the Clean Air Act Amendments (CAAA) of 1990. When the regulations are enacted in 1992, the base will be out of compliance. Non-compliance with the VOC/AIR emission statutes would subject Dover AFB to the potential for notices of violation, compliance orders and fines. Regulators could shut-down the liquid fuel, deicing or industrial shops which would shut-down flying operations. There is no criterial/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, Standard Facility Requirements". Project has been considered for FY97 force structure end strength.</p>		
<u>STATE AND LOCATION</u>	<u>PROJECT TITLE</u>	<u>COST (\$000)</u>												
<u>DELAWARE</u>														
DOVER AFB (AMC) FJXT943002 211-159	INSTALL EMISSION CONTROL DEVICES	860												
<p>Install emission control devices. (Current Mission) This is a Level II environmental compliance project. Project is required to attain and maintain compliance with federal law and applicable regulations limiting the exhaust of volatile organic compounds (VOC). This legislation requires that Dover AFB use Maximum Available Control Technology (MACT) to reduce emissions of hazardous air pollutants by more than 90%. Dover currently produces 321 tons of VOC per year and must reduce these emissions to 32.1 tons per year. This project will enable Dover AFB to reduce VOC emissions at fuel transfer/storage locations, coating and cleaning operations and incinerator facilities. The base has contracted a firm to study air emissions on Dover. It evaluated liquid fuels and de-icer storage and transfer, stationary fuel burning sources, 40 industrial shops, three incinerators and mobile sources to include aircraft and vehicles. The study has determined that Dover AFB is a major stationary source of air emissions per federal Prevention of Serious Deterioration (PSD) Regulations, contained in 40 CFR 52.21. The study recommends that no major modifications be made to base boilers or liquid fuel operations without a PSD permit or reduction of emissions or both. The State of Delaware has been included within an interstate ozone implementation of Reasonable Available Control Technology (RACT) to reduce VOC emissions. Dover AFB does not meet the statutory requirements of the Clean Air Act Amendments (CAAA) of 1990. When the regulations are enacted in 1992, the base will be out of compliance. Non-compliance with the VOC/AIR emission statutes would subject Dover AFB to the potential for notices of violation, compliance orders and fines. Regulators could shut-down the liquid fuel, deicing or industrial shops which would shut-down flying operations. There is no criterial/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, Standard Facility Requirements". Project has been considered for FY97 force structure end strength.</p>														

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION DOVER AIR FORCE BASE, DELAWARE																								
4. PROJECT TITLE INSTALL EMISSION CONTROL DEVICES	5. PROJECT NUMBER FJXT943002																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="363 649 1428 776"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 OCT 12</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>93 MAR 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 JUL 14</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="363 840 1338 904"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="363 968 1420 1138"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>63</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>113</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>38</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 OCT 12	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	2%	(c) Date 35% Designed	93 MAR 15	(d) Date Design Complete	93 JUL 14	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	50	(b) All Other Design Costs	63	(c) Total	113	(d) Contract	75	(e) In-house	38
(a) Date Design Started	92 OCT 12																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	2%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	93 MAR 15																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 JUL 14																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	50																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	63																							
(c) Total	113																							
(d) Contract	75																							
(e) In-house	38																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
---------------------------	--	---------

3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION
VARIOUS LOCATIONS - WITHIN THE UNITED STATES

4. PROJECT TITLE PROJECTS \$1 MILLION AND UNDER	5. PROJECT NUMBER
--	-------------------

<u>STATE AND LOCATION</u>	<u>PROJECT TITLE</u>	<u>COST (\$000)</u>
<u>FLORIDA</u>		
CAPE CANAVERAL AFS (SPC) DBEH933103 411-135	UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	400
<p>Remove, replace, or upgrade fuel storage tanks. (Current Mission). This is a Level II environmental compliance requirement. Tanks must be in compliance with DoD, Federal and State environmental regulations. These include the Air Force UST Management Strategy, Federal Regulation 40 CFR 280 and Florida Department of Environmental Regulations (FDER) 17.761 and 17.762. Seven regulated USTs require secondary containment or leak detection for piping systems and overflow protection/dispenser lines by Dec 1998 per Florida (FDER) 17.61.510 (6) Table 1, installed after 1984: R,P, & L required. Two USTs will be removed and five upgraded. Twelve regulated AST systems require overflow protection by Dec 1999 in accordance with Florida (FDER) 17.72.520(1)(a). Seven UST and eleven AST systems are regulated and are subject to 1998 and 1999 deadlines, respectively. Tanks will age and further deteriorate. There will be a continued risk of leaks and spills which would be harmful to CCAFS natural resources and personnel. The Installation will be out of compliance with Federal and State regulations and subject to fines. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide".</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE				
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION CAPE CANAVERAL AIR FORCE STATION, FLORIDA						
4. PROJECT TITLE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	5. PROJECT NUMBER DBEH933103					
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Project to be accomplished by one step turn key procedures</p> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="388 703 1362 766"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Design Allowance 24</p> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO					
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A					

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION VARIOUS LOCATIONS - WITHIN THE UNITED STATES		
4. PROJECT TITLE PROJECTS \$1 MILLION AND UNDER	5. PROJECT NUMBER	
<u>STATE AND LOCATION</u> <u>FLORIDA</u> CAPE CANAVERAL AFS (SPC) DBEH943007 811-147	<u>PROJECT TITLE</u> SLFI - BACKUP POWER	<u>COST (\$000)</u> 800
<p>Provide backup power and SSUPS to the Central Telemetry Facility and Delta Integration & Checkout Facility. (Current Mission) This is a Space Launch Facilities Infrastructure (SLFI) requirement. The Medium Launch Vehicle (Delta) Integration & Checkout Facility at Cape Canaveral needs backup generator and SSUPS capability in order to avoid delays in testing of Delta launch vehicle equipment due to power outage or voltage fluctuations. The Central Telemetry Facility (located across the Banana River from Cape Canaveral) requires backup generator and SSUPS capability to avoid delays in launches. The SSUPS will be procured with equipment funds. The facilities currently have no backup power. When power outages or voltage fluctuations occur at the Medium Launch Vehicle Checkout Facility, critical testing of Delta launch vehicle equipment is aborted and must be rescheduled. Without the Central Telemetry Facility in full operation, launch schedules must be suspended. Power outages/fluctuations equate to delayed launch schedules. With the increasing frequency of launches, delays can generally affect future launch timetables, not just the current one. Missions impacted include Defense Satellite Communications System (DSCS), Global Positioning System (GPS), Defense Meteorological Satellite Program (DMSP), Shuttle, and classified launches. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide" or AFM 86-2, "Standard Facilities Requirements".</p>		

1. COMPONENT	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)		2. DATE
AIR FORCE			
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION			
CAPE CANAVERAL AIR FORCE STATION, FLORIDA			
4. PROJECT TITLE		5. PROJECT NUMBER	
SLFI - BACKUP POWER		DBEH943007	
12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:			
a. Estimated Design Data:			
(1) Status:			
(a) Date Design Started		92 AUG 12	
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%	
(c) Date 35% Designed		92 OCT 14	
(d) Date Design Complete		93 AUG 01	
(2) Basis:			
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO	
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A	
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e):			(\$000)
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications			48
(b) All Other Design Costs			33
(c) Total			81
(d) Contract			65
(e) In-house			16
(4) Construction Start			93 DEC
b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations:			
EQUIPMENT NOMENCLATURE	PROCURING APPROPRIATION	FISCAL YEAR APPROPRIATED OR REQUESTED	COST (\$000)
SOLID STATE UPS	3080	1994	170

1. COMPONENT	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
AIR FORCE		

3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION
 VARIOUS LOCATIONS - WITHIN THE UNITED STATES

4. PROJECT TITLE	5. PROJECT NUMBER
PROJECTS \$1 MILLION AND UNDER	

<u>STATE AND LOCATION</u>	<u>PROJECT TITLE</u>	<u>COST (\$000)</u>
<u>GEORGIA</u>		
ROBINS AFB (MTC) UHZ923007 218-712	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT PAINT FACILITY	970
<p>Construct an aircraft support equipment paint facility. (Current Mission) This is a Level II environmental compliance project. A fully enclosed, environmentally controlled high-bay facility is required for cleaning and painting of tail stands, wing platforms, and other aircraft support equipment used in performing depot maintenance of large military aircraft. This project is needed to sustain compliance with air pollution limits pursuant to Georgia Permit 9711-076-10153 as regulated under Georgia Air Quality Regulation 391-3-1-.03, and to meet emission standards defined by Georgia Air Quality Regulation 391-3-1-.02(2)(a) pertaining to protection of personnel and the environment. Clean Air Act amendments of 1990 require that these standards be enforced by 1995. Functional aircraft support equipment is essential in depot maintenance operations. All equipment needs to be stripped of paint, repaired as necessary and repainted periodically to extend service life of the equipment. One fifth of the inventory is painted annually. Some tail stands require at least 60 feet vertical clearance. Robins AFB does not have a facility for stripping and painting of large aircraft support equipment. As such, stripping (sand blasting) and painting operations are performed outdoors but only on dry days when winds are calm. Even under these conditions, grit and dirt can contaminate painted articles, paint overspray can damage vehicles and equipment, and personal health hazard may occur. Also, emissions must be controlled to meet state air emission standards. Currently, weather conditions dictate when corrosion control activities can be performed, resulting in delays and inefficiencies. As there are no installed control devices for reducing air emissions generated by this operation and the total base emissions exceed 80 percent of the allowable level, continued outdoor stripping and painting will place the base in violation of air quality standards and permit conditions by 1995. Robins AFB will be in jeopardy of exceeding the 100 Ton/year limitation on basewide VOC emissions, resulting in fines or a court order to cease outdoor painting. Additionally, manpower will continue to be wasted when high winds dictate cessation of paint spraying and stripping operations, and the Air Force could be subjected to claims for damage of private property. Suspension of equipment painting would increase corrosion and render equipment unsafe, impacting mission capabilities within one year. The requirement for this project was validated by the Joint Service Depot Maintenance Industrial Military Construction Review Panel in May 1990. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION VARIOUS LOCATIONS - WITHIN THE UNITED STATES								
4. PROJECT TITLE PROJECTS \$1 MILLION AND UNDER	5. PROJECT NUMBER							
<table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="211 506 505 537"><u>STATE AND LOCATION</u></th> <th data-bbox="712 506 921 537"><u>PROJECT TITLE</u></th> <th data-bbox="1306 478 1400 537"><u>COST</u> <u>(\$000)</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="3" data-bbox="211 569 1400 636">Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". The project scope was developed based upon the size and quantity of equipment to be painted.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			<u>STATE AND LOCATION</u>	<u>PROJECT TITLE</u>	<u>COST</u> <u>(\$000)</u>	Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". The project scope was developed based upon the size and quantity of equipment to be painted.		
<u>STATE AND LOCATION</u>	<u>PROJECT TITLE</u>	<u>COST</u> <u>(\$000)</u>						
Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". The project scope was developed based upon the size and quantity of equipment to be painted.								

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																																													
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ROBINS AIR FORCE BASE, GEORGIA																																															
4. PROJECT TITLE AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT PAINT FACILITY	5. PROJECT NUMBER UHHZ923007																																														
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td colspan="3">(1) Status:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td></td> <td>92 SEP 20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td></td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designea</td> <td></td> <td>92 OCT 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td></td> <td>93 JUN 30</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(2) Basis:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td></td> <td>YES</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td></td> <td>ROBINS</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td></td> <td>23</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td></td> <td>70</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td></td> <td>93</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> <td>56</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td></td> <td>37</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(4) Construction Start</td> <td></td> <td>93 DEC</td> </tr> </table> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(1) Status:			(a) Date Design Started		92 SEP 20	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%	(c) Date 35% Designea		92 OCT 15	(d) Date Design Complete		93 JUN 30	(2) Basis:			(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		YES	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		ROBINS	(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)			(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		23	(b) All Other Design Costs		70	(c) Total		93	(d) Contract		56	(e) In-house		37	(4) Construction Start		93 DEC
(1) Status:																																															
(a) Date Design Started		92 SEP 20																																													
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%																																													
(c) Date 35% Designea		92 OCT 15																																													
(d) Date Design Complete		93 JUN 30																																													
(2) Basis:																																															
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		YES																																													
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		ROBINS																																													
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)																																															
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		23																																													
(b) All Other Design Costs		70																																													
(c) Total		93																																													
(d) Contract		56																																													
(e) In-house		37																																													
(4) Construction Start		93 DEC																																													

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE												
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION VARIOUS LOCATIONS - WITHIN THE UNITED STATES														
4. PROJECT TITLE PROJECTS \$1 MILLION AND UNDER	5. PROJECT NUMBER													
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="189 504 693 546"><u>STATE AND LOCATION</u></th> <th data-bbox="693 504 1288 546"><u>PROJECT TITLE</u></th> <th data-bbox="1288 504 1427 546"><u>COST (\$000)</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="3" data-bbox="189 567 1427 609"><u>KANSAS</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="189 630 693 735">MCCONNELL AFB (CSV) PRQE925001 149-962</td> <td data-bbox="693 630 1288 735">CONTROL TOWER CAB</td> <td data-bbox="1288 630 1427 735">900</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3" data-bbox="189 756 1427 1491"> <p>Construct new 540 square foot air traffic control tower cab. (Current Mission) A new air traffic control tower cab to accommodate up to 11 air traffic control personnel, air traffic control communication equipment, crew briefings, operations and training functions. The McConnell control tower was constructed in 1969. The cab was built to accommodate three controllers and the standard compliment of 1960s vintage equipment. The base mission and characteristics of the aircraft have changed significantly since then. The number of aircraft operations have increased, and McConnell now leads ACC bases in air traffic control operations with over 110,000 take-offs and landings annually. McConnell is home base for one B1-B squadron, one KC-135R squadron, one Air National Guard combat-ready F-16 fighter squadron, and two Air National Guard F-16 training squadrons. As a result, more air controllers and equipment are needed than in 1969 to cover the expanded airfield operations. Overcrowded cab conditions limit air traffic controller mobility and impact controller communications with pilots. These conditions, coupled with the additional effort required to safely control inexperienced F-16 fighter training pilots, create conditions that could jeopardize pilot safety and cause aircraft loss. The project is part of the Air Force Control Tower Upgrade Program managed by Air Force Communications Command (AFCC). There are no criteria for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide," or in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements."</p> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			<u>STATE AND LOCATION</u>	<u>PROJECT TITLE</u>	<u>COST (\$000)</u>	<u>KANSAS</u>			MCCONNELL AFB (CSV) PRQE925001 149-962	CONTROL TOWER CAB	900	<p>Construct new 540 square foot air traffic control tower cab. (Current Mission) A new air traffic control tower cab to accommodate up to 11 air traffic control personnel, air traffic control communication equipment, crew briefings, operations and training functions. The McConnell control tower was constructed in 1969. The cab was built to accommodate three controllers and the standard compliment of 1960s vintage equipment. The base mission and characteristics of the aircraft have changed significantly since then. The number of aircraft operations have increased, and McConnell now leads ACC bases in air traffic control operations with over 110,000 take-offs and landings annually. McConnell is home base for one B1-B squadron, one KC-135R squadron, one Air National Guard combat-ready F-16 fighter squadron, and two Air National Guard F-16 training squadrons. As a result, more air controllers and equipment are needed than in 1969 to cover the expanded airfield operations. Overcrowded cab conditions limit air traffic controller mobility and impact controller communications with pilots. These conditions, coupled with the additional effort required to safely control inexperienced F-16 fighter training pilots, create conditions that could jeopardize pilot safety and cause aircraft loss. The project is part of the Air Force Control Tower Upgrade Program managed by Air Force Communications Command (AFCC). There are no criteria for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide," or in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements."</p>		
<u>STATE AND LOCATION</u>	<u>PROJECT TITLE</u>	<u>COST (\$000)</u>												
<u>KANSAS</u>														
MCCONNELL AFB (CSV) PRQE925001 149-962	CONTROL TOWER CAB	900												
<p>Construct new 540 square foot air traffic control tower cab. (Current Mission) A new air traffic control tower cab to accommodate up to 11 air traffic control personnel, air traffic control communication equipment, crew briefings, operations and training functions. The McConnell control tower was constructed in 1969. The cab was built to accommodate three controllers and the standard compliment of 1960s vintage equipment. The base mission and characteristics of the aircraft have changed significantly since then. The number of aircraft operations have increased, and McConnell now leads ACC bases in air traffic control operations with over 110,000 take-offs and landings annually. McConnell is home base for one B1-B squadron, one KC-135R squadron, one Air National Guard combat-ready F-16 fighter squadron, and two Air National Guard F-16 training squadrons. As a result, more air controllers and equipment are needed than in 1969 to cover the expanded airfield operations. Overcrowded cab conditions limit air traffic controller mobility and impact controller communications with pilots. These conditions, coupled with the additional effort required to safely control inexperienced F-16 fighter training pilots, create conditions that could jeopardize pilot safety and cause aircraft loss. The project is part of the Air Force Control Tower Upgrade Program managed by Air Force Communications Command (AFCC). There are no criteria for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide," or in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements."</p>														

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION MCCONNELL AIR FORCE BASE, KANSAS																								
4. PROJECT TITLE CONTROL TOWER CAB	5. PROJECT NUMBER PRQE925001																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="360 632 1410 762"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 SEP 17</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 OCT 14</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 APR 04</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="360 827 1328 890"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="360 953 1410 1110"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>54</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>74</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>49</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>25</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 JAN</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 SEP 17	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	50%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 OCT 14	(d) Date Design Complete	93 APR 04	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	54	(b) All Other Design Costs	20	(c) Total	74	(d) Contract	49	(e) In-house	25
(a) Date Design Started	92 SEP 17																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	50%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 OCT 14																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 APR 04																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	54																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	20																							
(c) Total	74																							
(d) Contract	49																							
(e) In-house	25																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE												
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION VARIOUS LOCATIONS - WITHIN THE UNITED STATES														
4. PROJECT TITLE PROJECTS \$1 MILLION AND UNDER	5. PROJECT NUMBER													
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="208 506 500 537"><u>STATE AND LOCATION</u></th> <th data-bbox="707 506 915 537"><u>PROJECT TITLE</u></th> <th data-bbox="1301 474 1397 537"><u>COST (\$000)</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="3" data-bbox="208 573 307 604"><u>KANSAS</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="241 636 546 726">MCCONNEL' AFB (ACC) PRQE910077 921-167</td> <td data-bbox="707 636 1108 695">LAND RESTRICTIVE EASEMENT ACQUISITION</td> <td data-bbox="1318 636 1384 663">1000</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3" data-bbox="208 762 1397 1902"> <p>Land restrictive easement acquisition. (Current Mission) To establish a permanent interest in a northern clear zone which will enable the Air Force to control construction which could affect navigable air space, to limit land uses to those compatible with the noise environment associated with military flying installations and to reduce public exposure to hazards associated with flying missions. Obtain from the land owner an environmental baseline report acceptable to the Air Force and detailing the extent and type of any contamination on the land to be acquired under this easement. The land immediately adjacent to the northern boundary of McConnell AFB is owned by Cessna Aircraft Company, a subsidiary of General Dynamics, who may legally develop the property in accordance with recently adopted city/county Airport Overlay District (AOD) guidelines. Such development could be in conflict with base operations. The eastern two thirds of the northern clear zone is undeveloped land used primarily for agriculture and is included in the proposed easement. The remaining one third of the clear zone is developed property containing Cessna manufacturing facilities. The cost to obtain an easement on this tract is prohibitive. While AOD generally follows Air Force Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone (AICUZ) land use recommendations, some differences do exist. AICUZ allows only non-livestock agriculture in the clear zone, while AOD guidelines allow parking lots, storage areas/yards, aircraft runways and taxiways, cemeteries and all agriculture. Cessna could also pursue litigation to legally change zoning regulations for specific uses which could be incompatible with McConnell's flying mission. The cost to fee purchase this tract is equal to or slightly more than the cost to obtain this restrictive perpetual easement. Fee ownership is not being pursued due to an existing contamination problem on this tract and liability issues for the Air Force under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA). The Air Force is not responsible for generating any of this contamination. The restrictive easement will be written so that any environmental liabilities will be borne by Cessna through indemnity and lease provisions in the easement. Cessna is to retain all responsibility for remediating the site. Incompatible development in the runway clear zone could impact flying operations at this installation and could jeopardize the safety of people and property.</p> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			<u>STATE AND LOCATION</u>	<u>PROJECT TITLE</u>	<u>COST (\$000)</u>	<u>KANSAS</u>			MCCONNEL' AFB (ACC) PRQE910077 921-167	LAND RESTRICTIVE EASEMENT ACQUISITION	1000	<p>Land restrictive easement acquisition. (Current Mission) To establish a permanent interest in a northern clear zone which will enable the Air Force to control construction which could affect navigable air space, to limit land uses to those compatible with the noise environment associated with military flying installations and to reduce public exposure to hazards associated with flying missions. Obtain from the land owner an environmental baseline report acceptable to the Air Force and detailing the extent and type of any contamination on the land to be acquired under this easement. The land immediately adjacent to the northern boundary of McConnell AFB is owned by Cessna Aircraft Company, a subsidiary of General Dynamics, who may legally develop the property in accordance with recently adopted city/county Airport Overlay District (AOD) guidelines. Such development could be in conflict with base operations. The eastern two thirds of the northern clear zone is undeveloped land used primarily for agriculture and is included in the proposed easement. The remaining one third of the clear zone is developed property containing Cessna manufacturing facilities. The cost to obtain an easement on this tract is prohibitive. While AOD generally follows Air Force Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone (AICUZ) land use recommendations, some differences do exist. AICUZ allows only non-livestock agriculture in the clear zone, while AOD guidelines allow parking lots, storage areas/yards, aircraft runways and taxiways, cemeteries and all agriculture. Cessna could also pursue litigation to legally change zoning regulations for specific uses which could be incompatible with McConnell's flying mission. The cost to fee purchase this tract is equal to or slightly more than the cost to obtain this restrictive perpetual easement. Fee ownership is not being pursued due to an existing contamination problem on this tract and liability issues for the Air Force under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA). The Air Force is not responsible for generating any of this contamination. The restrictive easement will be written so that any environmental liabilities will be borne by Cessna through indemnity and lease provisions in the easement. Cessna is to retain all responsibility for remediating the site. Incompatible development in the runway clear zone could impact flying operations at this installation and could jeopardize the safety of people and property.</p>		
<u>STATE AND LOCATION</u>	<u>PROJECT TITLE</u>	<u>COST (\$000)</u>												
<u>KANSAS</u>														
MCCONNEL' AFB (ACC) PRQE910077 921-167	LAND RESTRICTIVE EASEMENT ACQUISITION	1000												
<p>Land restrictive easement acquisition. (Current Mission) To establish a permanent interest in a northern clear zone which will enable the Air Force to control construction which could affect navigable air space, to limit land uses to those compatible with the noise environment associated with military flying installations and to reduce public exposure to hazards associated with flying missions. Obtain from the land owner an environmental baseline report acceptable to the Air Force and detailing the extent and type of any contamination on the land to be acquired under this easement. The land immediately adjacent to the northern boundary of McConnell AFB is owned by Cessna Aircraft Company, a subsidiary of General Dynamics, who may legally develop the property in accordance with recently adopted city/county Airport Overlay District (AOD) guidelines. Such development could be in conflict with base operations. The eastern two thirds of the northern clear zone is undeveloped land used primarily for agriculture and is included in the proposed easement. The remaining one third of the clear zone is developed property containing Cessna manufacturing facilities. The cost to obtain an easement on this tract is prohibitive. While AOD generally follows Air Force Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone (AICUZ) land use recommendations, some differences do exist. AICUZ allows only non-livestock agriculture in the clear zone, while AOD guidelines allow parking lots, storage areas/yards, aircraft runways and taxiways, cemeteries and all agriculture. Cessna could also pursue litigation to legally change zoning regulations for specific uses which could be incompatible with McConnell's flying mission. The cost to fee purchase this tract is equal to or slightly more than the cost to obtain this restrictive perpetual easement. Fee ownership is not being pursued due to an existing contamination problem on this tract and liability issues for the Air Force under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA). The Air Force is not responsible for generating any of this contamination. The restrictive easement will be written so that any environmental liabilities will be borne by Cessna through indemnity and lease provisions in the easement. Cessna is to retain all responsibility for remediating the site. Incompatible development in the runway clear zone could impact flying operations at this installation and could jeopardize the safety of people and property.</p>														

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																				
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION MCCONNELL AIR FORCE BASE, KANSAS																						
4. PROJECT TITLE LAND RESTRICTIVE EASEMENT ACQUISITION	5. PROJECT NUMBER PRQE910077																					
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="360 638 1404 776"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 SEP 29</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 NOV 10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 MAY 10</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <p>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</p> <p>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</p> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e):</p> <table data-bbox="360 936 1404 1127"> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right;">(\$000)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td style="text-align: right;">10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td style="text-align: right;">10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td style="text-align: right;">10</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start</p> <p style="text-align: right;">93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 SEP 29	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 NOV 10	(d) Date Design Complete	93 MAY 10		(\$000)	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	10	(b) All Other Design Costs		(c) Total	10	(d) Contract		(e) In-house	10
(a) Date Design Started	92 SEP 29																					
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																					
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 NOV 10																					
(d) Date Design Complete	93 MAY 10																					
	(\$000)																					
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	10																					
(b) All Other Design Costs																						
(c) Total	10																					
(d) Contract																						
(e) In-house	10																					

1. COMPONENT	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
AIR FORCE		

3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION
VARIOUS LOCATIONS - WITHIN THE UNITED STATES

4. PROJECT TITLE	5. PROJECT NUMBER
PROJECTS \$1 MILLION AND UNDER	

<u>STATE AND LOCATION</u>	<u>PROJECT TITLE</u>	<u>COST (\$000)</u>
<u>LOUISIANA</u>		
BARKSDALE AFB (ACC) AWUB935001 872-247	WEAPONS STORAGE AREA SECURITY	960
<p>Weapons storage area security improvements. (Current Mission) Adequate Weapons Storage Area (WSA) security to deter or delay intrusion and meet Department of Defense (DOD) protection criteria as identified in DOD Manual 5210.41. Department of Defense guidelines for security of Weapons Storage Areas require specific fence heights, and anchoring and stabilizing systems to ensure the integrity of security devices. A "double fence" system is required which includes an outer six-foot-high animal control fence to reduce false alarms from security sensors, and an inner 7-foot-high (plus outrigger) security fence on which sensors are mounted. Inner fences must be capable of supporting installation of second generation Fence Protection System sensors scheduled for installation in the future. All WSAs also require interior and exterior all weather access to permit a five-minute response time for any security alarm or incident. This project corrects a nuclear surety deficiency. The existing WSA fence does not meet DOD standards for fence height and does not meet security requirements. For example, fence braces are on the outside of the secure zone which makes the fence easy to scale. In addition, the fence is old and will not support installation of new second generation Fence Protection System sensors scheduled to be installed in June 1994 at a cost of \$2.3M. Current patrol roads are in poor condition and do not permit all weather response in accordance with DOD timing criteria. Inclement weather vehicle patrols are impeded by adverse terrain and swampy conditions in many areas adjacent to the WSA. This is the largest WSA in the Command. It is too large to effectively cover by foot patrol. This project will also remove an existing old and unneeded fence which is located between the required interior/exterior fences. This project will eliminate four DOD nuclear security/surety waivers and variances. Security for critical and sensitive munitions assets will not meet DOD requirements. Waivers will be required to continue use of the WSA. If waivers cannot be obtained, the base mission cannot be executed. Installation of second generation security sensors will be delayed until an adequate interior fence is provided. Security for munitions will be jeopardized, with possible major consequences and adverse publicity should the area be penetrated by unauthorized personnel. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements".</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																										
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION BARKSDALE AIR FORCE BASE, LOUISIANA																												
4. PROJECT TITLE WEAPONS STORAGE AREA SECURITY	5. PROJECT NUMBER AWUB935001																											
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="351 630 1428 766"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 JUL 12</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 SEP 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 JUN 15</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <p>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</p> <p>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</p> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="351 945 1428 1113"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>57</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>53</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>110</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>110</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 MAR</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations:</p> <table data-bbox="186 1396 1428 1585"> <thead> <tr> <th>EQUIPMENT NOMENCLATURE</th> <th>PROCURING APPROPRIATION</th> <th>FISCAL YEAR APPROPRIATED OR REQUESTED</th> <th>COST (\$000)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>DTR 90 VERTICAL TAUT WIRE SENSORS/FENCE PROTECTION SYS-2</td> <td>3080</td> <td>94</td> <td>2300</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			(a) Date Design Started	92 JUL 12	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 SEP 01	(d) Date Design Complete	93 JUN 15	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	57	(b) All Other Design Costs	53	(c) Total	110	(d) Contract		(e) In-house	110	EQUIPMENT NOMENCLATURE	PROCURING APPROPRIATION	FISCAL YEAR APPROPRIATED OR REQUESTED	COST (\$000)	DTR 90 VERTICAL TAUT WIRE SENSORS/FENCE PROTECTION SYS-2	3080	94	2300
(a) Date Design Started	92 JUL 12																											
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																											
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 SEP 01																											
(d) Date Design Complete	93 JUN 15																											
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	57																											
(b) All Other Design Costs	53																											
(c) Total	110																											
(d) Contract																												
(e) In-house	110																											
EQUIPMENT NOMENCLATURE	PROCURING APPROPRIATION	FISCAL YEAR APPROPRIATED OR REQUESTED	COST (\$000)																									
DTR 90 VERTICAL TAUT WIRE SENSORS/FENCE PROTECTION SYS-2	3080	94	2300																									

1. COMPONENT	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
AIR FORCE		

3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION
VARIOUS LOCATIONS - WITHIN THE UNITED STATES

4. PROJECT TITLE	5. PROJECT NUMBER
PROJECTS \$1 MILLION AND UNDER	

<u>STATE AND LOCATION</u>	<u>PROJECT TITLE</u>	<u>COST (\$000)</u>
<u>MARYLAND</u>		
ANDREWS AFB (AMC) AJXF953020 179-511	FIRE TRAINING FACILITY (DBOF)	1000
<p>Construct fire training facility. (Current Mission) This is a Level II environmental compliance project. A live fire training facility is required to meet all environmental and safety regulations. Live fire training exercises, an FAA quarterly requirement, enable fire fighters to maintain a high level of proficiency by extinguishing two types of live fires: mass fuel spills and three dimensional (running fuel) fires. These exercises, performed on mock-ups typical of the mission assigned aircraft, have created compliance problems with the Clean Water Act. An impermeable lining below the pit area is required to prevent waste oils and fuels from leaching into the ground and contaminating the groundwater. The existing live fire training facility violated EPA pollution standards and was closed 30 April 1990. It is inadequate for training as defined by Air Force regulation. The current aircraft mock-up is smaller than the required size and is not accessible for multi-directional approaches creating an artificial environment which limits the quality of training. The existing facility does not have high-density polyethylene flexible membrane liners and nets, a leak detection system, and spill containment capability. There are no environmentally approved live fire training facilities in the local area. The existing facility is closed because of previous violations of environmental requirements. Required live fire training for the assigned fire fighters is not available. Without the stress and realism that come only with live fires, the fire fighters lose proficiency in combating fires. The potential for loss of aircraft and life is increased. There are no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". This project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements". Project has been considered for FY97 force structure end strength.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ANDREWS AIR FORCE BASE, MARYLAND																								
4. PROJECT TITLE FIRE TRAINING FACILITY (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER AJXF953020																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="357 630 1412 766"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 OCT 10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>65%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 OCT 31</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 OCT 10</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="357 819 1412 892"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>YES</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>SCOTT</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="357 945 1412 1113"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>60</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>80</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>60</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>20</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 OCT 10	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	65%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 OCT 31	(d) Date Design Complete	93 OCT 10	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	YES	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	SCOTT	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	60	(b) All Other Design Costs	20	(c) Total	80	(d) Contract	60	(e) In-house	20
(a) Date Design Started	92 OCT 10																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	65%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 OCT 31																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 OCT 10																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	YES																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	SCOTT																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	60																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	20																							
(c) Total	80																							
(d) Contract	60																							
(e) In-house	20																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION VARIOUS LOCATIONS - WITHIN THE UNITED STATES		
4. PROJECT TITLE PROJECTS \$1 MILLION AND UNDER	5. PROJECT NUMBER	
<u>STATE AND LOCATION</u> <u>MISSISSIPPI</u> KEESLER AFB (ATC) MAHG943009 179-511	<u>PROJECT TITLE</u> FIRE TRAINING FACILITY	<u>COST (\$000)</u> 690
<p>Construct a fire training facility. (Current Mission) This is a Level I environmental compliance project. Air Force Regulation specifies that quarterly day and night live training be performed by all fire fighting personnel. Facility will allow all fire fighters to remain proficient in AFFF application techniques and aircraft crash rescue fire fighting. The existing site was closed in June 1991 due to groundwater contamination from previous exercises and is currently designated as an IRP site undergoing remedial investigation. Since the closure, live fire training has ceased. Approximately seventy fire fighters would have to travel to another DOD or civilian facility for training. The cost for travel, per diem, and overtime pay for civilian fire fighters will be extremely high. Location and distance of the closest environmentally acceptable training facility will require overnight stays for training. Fire fighters will not remain proficient in aircraft crash fire fighting and rescue techniques. The safety of both firefighters and accident victims will continue to be compromised. TDY training is not feasible due to funded level of manning and mission support requirements. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements".</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION KEESLER AIR FORCE BASE, MISSISSIPPI																								
4. PROJECT TITLE FIRE TRAINING FACILITY	5. PROJECT NUMBER MAHG943009																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="360 632 1433 762"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 AUG 06</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 OCT 06</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 AUG 20</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="360 825 1433 888"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>YES</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>REESE</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="360 951 1433 1108"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>90</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>60</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>30</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 AUG 06	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 OCT 06	(d) Date Design Complete	93 AUG 20	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	YES	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	REESE	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	40	(b) All Other Design Costs	50	(c) Total	90	(d) Contract	60	(e) In-house	30
(a) Date Design Started	92 AUG 06																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 OCT 06																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 AUG 20																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	YES																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	REESE																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	40																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	50																							
(c) Total	90																							
(d) Contract	60																							
(e) In-house	30																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE												
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION VARIOUS LOCATIONS - WITHIN THE UNITED STATES														
4. PROJECT TITLE PROJECTS \$1 MILLION AND UNDER	5. PROJECT NUMBER													
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="189 514 702 546"><u>STATE AND LOCATION</u></th> <th data-bbox="702 514 1296 546"><u>PROJECT TITLE</u></th> <th data-bbox="1296 514 1424 546"><u>COST (\$000)</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="3" data-bbox="189 577 1424 609"><u>MISSISSIPPI</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="189 640 702 735">KEESLER AFB (ATC) MAHG933003 411-135</td> <td data-bbox="702 640 1296 735">UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS</td> <td data-bbox="1296 640 1424 735">600</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3" data-bbox="189 766 1424 1533"> <p>Upgrade or replace existing underground storage tanks. (Current Mission) This is a Level II environmental compliance project. Upgrade all underground storage tanks (USTs) regulated by Title 40 Code of Federal Regulations, part 280 to new Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) standards. The EPA has set standards requiring all USTs to have leak detection, corrosion protection and spill/overflow prevention systems by December 1998. Existing USTs must be upgraded to comply with new standards, replaced with new UST systems, or replaced with aboveground tanks. Tanks range in age from 10 to 48 years. Cathodic action continues to weaken tanks increasing potential for leaks. USTs have to be leak-tested annually until they are upgraded with permanent leak detection systems. Testing costs are estimated at about \$1,000 per UST. Installation of permanent leak detection systems will eliminate recurring testing costs. In addition, the various upgrades will also help prevent releases which could result in future AF liability and expensive cleanup costs. Command-wide testing activities accomplished to date indicate a leak test failure rate of approximately 5%. USTs included in this project supports power production, fuels maintenance, AAFES, and military service station operations. Potential shutdown of mission essential facilities as leaks occur. Annual expenditure for tank inspections will continue. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements".</p> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			<u>STATE AND LOCATION</u>	<u>PROJECT TITLE</u>	<u>COST (\$000)</u>	<u>MISSISSIPPI</u>			KEESLER AFB (ATC) MAHG933003 411-135	UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	600	<p>Upgrade or replace existing underground storage tanks. (Current Mission) This is a Level II environmental compliance project. Upgrade all underground storage tanks (USTs) regulated by Title 40 Code of Federal Regulations, part 280 to new Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) standards. The EPA has set standards requiring all USTs to have leak detection, corrosion protection and spill/overflow prevention systems by December 1998. Existing USTs must be upgraded to comply with new standards, replaced with new UST systems, or replaced with aboveground tanks. Tanks range in age from 10 to 48 years. Cathodic action continues to weaken tanks increasing potential for leaks. USTs have to be leak-tested annually until they are upgraded with permanent leak detection systems. Testing costs are estimated at about \$1,000 per UST. Installation of permanent leak detection systems will eliminate recurring testing costs. In addition, the various upgrades will also help prevent releases which could result in future AF liability and expensive cleanup costs. Command-wide testing activities accomplished to date indicate a leak test failure rate of approximately 5%. USTs included in this project supports power production, fuels maintenance, AAFES, and military service station operations. Potential shutdown of mission essential facilities as leaks occur. Annual expenditure for tank inspections will continue. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements".</p>		
<u>STATE AND LOCATION</u>	<u>PROJECT TITLE</u>	<u>COST (\$000)</u>												
<u>MISSISSIPPI</u>														
KEESLER AFB (ATC) MAHG933003 411-135	UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	600												
<p>Upgrade or replace existing underground storage tanks. (Current Mission) This is a Level II environmental compliance project. Upgrade all underground storage tanks (USTs) regulated by Title 40 Code of Federal Regulations, part 280 to new Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) standards. The EPA has set standards requiring all USTs to have leak detection, corrosion protection and spill/overflow prevention systems by December 1998. Existing USTs must be upgraded to comply with new standards, replaced with new UST systems, or replaced with aboveground tanks. Tanks range in age from 10 to 48 years. Cathodic action continues to weaken tanks increasing potential for leaks. USTs have to be leak-tested annually until they are upgraded with permanent leak detection systems. Testing costs are estimated at about \$1,000 per UST. Installation of permanent leak detection systems will eliminate recurring testing costs. In addition, the various upgrades will also help prevent releases which could result in future AF liability and expensive cleanup costs. Command-wide testing activities accomplished to date indicate a leak test failure rate of approximately 5%. USTs included in this project supports power production, fuels maintenance, AAFES, and military service station operations. Potential shutdown of mission essential facilities as leaks occur. Annual expenditure for tank inspections will continue. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements".</p>														

1. COMPONENT	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
AIR FORCE		
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION		
KEESLER AIR FORCE BASE, MISSISSIPPI		
4. PROJECT TITLE		5. PROJECT NUMBER
UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS		MAHG933003
12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:		
a. Estimated Design Data:		
(1) Status:		
(a) Date Design Started		92 AUG 27
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%
(c) Date 35% Designed		92 SEP 10
(d) Date Design Complete		93 JUL 23
(2) Basis:		
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		YES
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		KEESLER
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)		
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		35
(b) All Other Design Costs		55
(c) Total		90
(d) Contract		60
(e) In-house		30
(4) Construction Start		93 DEC
b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION VARIOUS LOCATIONS - WITHIN THE UNITED STATES		
4. PROJECT TITLE PROJECTS \$1 MILLION AND UNDER	5. PROJECT NUMBER	
<u>STATE AND LOCATION</u> <u>NEW MEXICO</u> CANNON AFB (ACC) CZQZ933002 116-665	<u>PROJECT TITLE</u> SOUND SUPPRESSOR SUPPORT PAD	<u>COST (\$000)</u> 665
<p>Provide support construction and utilities to accommodate installation of a sound suppressor facility. (Current Mission). Provide adequate sound suppression for the F-111 super wing with five flying squadrons. Sound suppressor facilities are required to perform aircraft engine tests, inspection, calibration, and repair. Sound suppressant qualities are required to eliminate health/occupational safety hazards and environmental problems associated with high noise levels created by aircraft engines running in military power and after-burner modes. The current delivery date for the sound suppressor is 1 June 1994. The current sound suppressors are running at 100% capacity. Adequate sound suppression facilities are not available to satisfy engine test stand and power pad requirements. The existing T-10 sound suppressors support 194 separate engines and 83 aircraft. Over the last year, 312 separate engines and 331 aircraft in the T-10 sound suppressors have been tested. This averages out to 26 separate engines and 28 aircraft run-ups per month. At Cannon AFB there are both the TF30P107 and TF30P109 engines which have a 0.9 hour Mean Time Between Maintenance (MTBM). Cannon AFB is projected to receive the TF30P111 engine with a 0.4 hour MTBM. The number of assigned aircraft will almost double within the next year. A majority of these will be the F-111F with the TF30P111 engine. Additionally, the spare engines and MTBM will increase the average monthly runs by 74 separate engines and 131 aircraft. The existing T-10 sound suppressors cannot handle this increased work load. A back log of engine/aircraft tests will result. Existing engine tests without adequate sound suppression will result in extreme noise levels which pose an occupational health hazard for maintenance personnel and are noise irritants to the adjacent community and work areas. The new sound suppressor will arrive 1 June 1994 but cannot be used until it is installed on this support pad. Effectiveness of engine maintenance will be compromised, severely limiting the wing's readiness. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide;" however, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements."</p>		

1. COMPONENT	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE	
AIR FORCE			
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION			
CANNON AIR FORCE BASE, NEW MEXICO			
4. PROJECT TITLE	5. PROJECT NUMBER		
SOUND SUPPRESSOR SUPPORT PAD	CZQZ933002		
12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:			
a. Estimated Design Data:			
(1) Status:			
(a) Date Design Started		92 JUN 02	
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%	
(c) Date 35% Designed		92 JUL 17	
(d) Date Design Complete		93 JUL 30	
(2) Basis:			
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO	
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A	
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)			
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		39	
(b) All Other Design Costs		20	
(c) Total		59	
(d) Contract		39	
(e) In-house		20	
(4) Construction Start		93 DEC	
b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations:			
EQUIPMENT NOMENCLATURE	PROCURING APPROPRIATION	FISCAL YEAR APPROPRIATED OR REQUESTED	COST (\$000)
DEMOUNTABLE HUSH HOUSE	3080	94	1500
T-20 ENGINE TEST STAND	3080	94	175
ENGINE GENERATOR (MC-1A)	3080	94	139
MOTOR GENERATOR	3080	94	9
RECTIFIER (B-9)	3080	94	2
TOTAL			1825

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION VARIOUS LOCATIONS - WITHIN THE UNITED STATES		
4. PROJECT TITLE PROJECTS \$1 MILLION AND UNDER	5. PROJECT NUMBER	
<u>STATE AND LOCATION</u> <u>NEW MEXICO</u> CANNON AFB (ACC) CZQZ943002 179-511	<u>PROJECT TITLE</u> FIRE TRAINING FACILITY	<u>COST (\$000)</u> 1000
<p>Construct a fire training facility. (Current Mission) This is a level I environmental compliance project. A live fire training facility meeting all environmental and safety regulations. Live fire training exercises, an FAA quarterly requirement, enable firefighters to maintain a high level of proficiency by extinguishing two types of live fires; mass fuel spills and three dimensional (running fuel) fires. These exercises, performed on mock-ups typical of the mission assigned aircraft, have historically created compliance problems with the Clean Water Act. An impermeable lining below the pit area is required to prevent fuel from leaching into the ground and to prevent groundwater from becoming contaminated by residual unburned fuel. The existing fire training facility was closed in September 1991. The existing aircraft fire training facility does not have high-density polyethylene flexible liners and nets, a leak detection system, or spill containment capability. Use of the existing facility and site is prohibited due to non-compliance with State and Federal environmental regulations. The existing facility, which was built in 1977, includes an F-111 aircraft mock-up, a drafting pit, fire hydrant, and a fuel storage tank. The mock-up is located in a shallow, gravel-covered, earthen pit which has a liner that does not meet environmental standards. Pollutants have the potential to be released to the surrounding soil and ground water. Firefighters are unable to train using live fire. Currently the base relies on mock firefighting techniques to develop tactics and strategy. The existing fire training facilities will remain out of compliance with State and Federal environmental laws. Firefighter proficiency will not be maintained. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide."</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION CANNON AIR FORCE BASE, NEW MEXICO																								
4. PROJECT TITLE FIRE TRAINING FACILITY	5. PROJECT NUMBER CZQZ943002																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="353 638 1410 768"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 MAY 19</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 JUL 07</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 JUL 09</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="353 831 1328 894"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="353 957 1410 1121"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>48</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>48</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 MAY 19	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 JUL 07	(d) Date Design Complete	93 JUL 09	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	40	(b) All Other Design Costs	8	(c) Total	48	(d) Contract		(e) In-house	48
(a) Date Design Started	92 MAY 19																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 JUL 07																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 JUL 09																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	40																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	8																							
(c) Total	48																							
(d) Contract																								
(e) In-house	48																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION VARIOUS LOCATIONS - WITHIN THE UNITED STATES		
4. PROJECT TITLE PROJECTS \$1 MILLION AND UNDER	5. PROJECT NUMBER	
<u>STATE AND LOCATION</u> <u>NEW MEXICO</u> HOLLOMAN AFB (ACC) KWRD943014 411-135	<u>PROJECT TITLE</u> UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	<u>COST (\$000)</u> 1000
<p>Remove/replace underground storage tanks (USTs). (Current Mission) This is a Level II environmental compliance project. Adequate fuel storage, properly designed and located, is required to satisfy base mission requirements. All petroleum dispensing and operating facilities must be provided with a means for detecting and preventing release of pollutants into the surrounding environment. All USTs must be upgraded in accordance with federal law (40 CFR 280.21) by December 1998. This includes leak detection, corrosion protection and spill/overflow prevention systems. Underground storage tanks at Holloman AFB do not meet federal requirements for corrosion protection, secondary containment, and overfill/spill protection. The condition of these tanks varies with a majority of the tanks at or exceeding their design life. These deficiencies must be corrected to prevent violation of federal UST regulations. If underground storage tanks require replacement, Air Force policy is to replace them with aboveground tanks or relocate them into underground vaults, whenever possible. Undetected UST releases can result in contamination of soil and ground water supplies, resulting in a threat to human health and the environment along with extremely costly cleanup measures. These improvements to USTs are mandated by federal law. If not accomplished by the established deadline, the base will be in violation of the law and subject to receiving Notices of Violation, fines and significant adverse publicity. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements".</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																																													
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION HOLLOMAN AIR FORCE BASE, NEW MEXICO																																															
4. PROJECT TITLE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	5. PROJECT NUMBER KWRD943014																																														
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td colspan="3">(1) Status:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td></td> <td>92 NOV 03</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td></td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td></td> <td>92 DEC 19</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td></td> <td>93 AUG 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(2) Basis:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td></td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td></td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td></td> <td>8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td></td> <td>8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td></td> <td>8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td></td> <td>8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(4) Construction Start</td> <td></td> <td>93 DEC</td> </tr> </table> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(1) Status:			(a) Date Design Started		92 NOV 03	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%	(c) Date 35% Designed		92 DEC 19	(d) Date Design Complete		93 AUG 15	(2) Basis:			(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A	(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)			(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		8	(b) All Other Design Costs		8	(c) Total		8	(d) Contract			(e) In-house		8	(4) Construction Start		93 DEC
(1) Status:																																															
(a) Date Design Started		92 NOV 03																																													
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%																																													
(c) Date 35% Designed		92 DEC 19																																													
(d) Date Design Complete		93 AUG 15																																													
(2) Basis:																																															
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO																																													
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A																																													
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)																																															
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		8																																													
(b) All Other Design Costs		8																																													
(c) Total		8																																													
(d) Contract																																															
(e) In-house		8																																													
(4) Construction Start		93 DEC																																													

1. COMPONENT	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
AIR FORCE		
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION		
VARIOUS LOCATIONS - WITHIN THE UNITED STATES		
4. PROJECT TITLE	5. PROJECT NUMBER	
PROJECTS \$1 MILLION AND UNDER		

<u>STATE AND LOCATION</u>	<u>PROJECT TITLE</u>	<u>COST (\$000)</u>
<u>NORTH CAROLINA</u>		
SEYMOUR-JOHNSON AFB (ACC) VKAG933005 610-144	MUNITIONS MAINTENANCE SUPPORT FACILITY	480

Construct a munitions maintenance support facility. (Current Mission) An adequate facility, remotely located from the base munitions maintenance explosive area, is required for personnel that are related to, but not directly involved in, the explosive operations of the base munitions maintenance function. This is required to comply with Department of Defense safety regulations and OSHA Standards 1910.109. The current arrangement places administrative personnel in unnecessary danger within the munitions building. Although these workers are directly related to the function, safety regulations and OSHA standard 1910.109, require that they be separated from the actual maintenance area. Combat Munitions Unit concept allows an office/training area within the Quantity Distance Zone but removed from the actual maintenance shop. The existing working conditions of the munitions management personnel in the maintenance shop directly threatens the safety of life of these personnel. An exemption to Quantity Distance criteria has been granted by the Secretary of the Air Force which requires that a facility be provided and personnel be relocated by December 1993. The base will seek a short extension to allow personnel to remain in the existing facility until construction is complete. Munitions management and administration personnel will continue to work in a hazardous area and in violation of OSHA explosives safety standards. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements".

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																																													
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION SEYMOUR JOHNSON AIR FORCE BASE, NORTH CAROLINA																																															
4. PROJECT TITLE MUNITIONS MAINTENANCE SUPPORT FACILITY	5. PROJECT NUMBER VKAG933005																																														
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td colspan="3">(1) Status:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td></td> <td>92 OCT 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td></td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td></td> <td>92 NOV 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td></td> <td>93 APR 30</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(2) Basis:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td></td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td></td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td></td> <td>29</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td></td> <td>48</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td></td> <td>77</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> <td>52</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td></td> <td>25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(4) Construction Start</td> <td></td> <td>94 JAN</td> </tr> </table> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(1) Status:			(a) Date Design Started		92 OCT 15	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%	(c) Date 35% Designed		92 NOV 15	(d) Date Design Complete		93 APR 30	(2) Basis:			(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A	(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)			(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		29	(b) All Other Design Costs		48	(c) Total		77	(d) Contract		52	(e) In-house		25	(4) Construction Start		94 JAN
(1) Status:																																															
(a) Date Design Started		92 OCT 15																																													
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%																																													
(c) Date 35% Designed		92 NOV 15																																													
(d) Date Design Complete		93 APR 30																																													
(2) Basis:																																															
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO																																													
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A																																													
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)																																															
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		29																																													
(b) All Other Design Costs		48																																													
(c) Total		77																																													
(d) Contract		52																																													
(e) In-house		25																																													
(4) Construction Start		94 JAN																																													

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION VARIOUS LOCATIONS - WITHIN THE UNITED STATES		
4. PROJECT TITLE PROJECTS \$1 MILLION AND UNDER	5. PROJECT NUMBER	
<u>STATE AND LOCATION</u> OKLAHOMA ALTUS AFB (AMC) AGGN943000 130-142	<u>PROJECT TITLE</u> C-17 FIRE STATION (DBOF)	<u>COST (\$000)</u> 780
<p>Construct C-17 fire station. (New Mission) A secondary fire station is needed to safeguard aircrews and aircraft on the assault strip (FY91 MILCON) and parallel runway (FY92 MILCON). This fire station will allow prepositioning of crash-rescue vehicles in close proximity to these new launch and recovery surfaces. Air Force regulations require that the fire department be able to respond to an unannounced aircraft emergency anywhere on the airfield within three minutes. Vehicles located at the base's single fire station cannot meet the response requirement to the new launch and recovery surfaces. Aircrew and aircraft will be at higher risk due to lack of fire protection in close proximity. Crash equipment will have to travel up to one mile further before they arrive at the accident scene. Minor accidents may become more severe, possibly resulting in the unnecessary loss of life, if the fire department cannot respond within three minutes. The base's airlift training and aerial refueling missions will be put at higher risk. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 85-2, "Standard Facility Requirements". Project has been considered for FY97 force structure end strength.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																																													
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ALTUS AIR FORCE BASE, OKLAHOMA																																															
4. PROJECT TITLE C-17 FIRE STATION (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER AGGN943000																																														
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <table data-bbox="305 598 1445 1186"> <tr> <td colspan="3">(1) Status:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td></td> <td>92 AUG 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td></td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td></td> <td>92 SEP 17</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td></td> <td>93 MAY 21</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(2) Basis:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td></td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td></td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td></td> <td>47</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td></td> <td>67</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td></td> <td>114</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> <td>82</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td></td> <td>32</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(4) Construction Start</td> <td></td> <td>94 FEB</td> </tr> </table> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(1) Status:			(a) Date Design Started		92 AUG 15	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%	(c) Date 35% Designed		92 SEP 17	(d) Date Design Complete		93 MAY 21	(2) Basis:			(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A	(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)			(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		47	(b) All Other Design Costs		67	(c) Total		114	(d) Contract		82	(e) In-house		32	(4) Construction Start		94 FEB
(1) Status:																																															
(a) Date Design Started		92 AUG 15																																													
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%																																													
(c) Date 35% Designed		92 SEP 17																																													
(d) Date Design Complete		93 MAY 21																																													
(2) Basis:																																															
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO																																													
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A																																													
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)																																															
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		47																																													
(b) All Other Design Costs		67																																													
(c) Total		114																																													
(d) Contract		82																																													
(e) In-house		32																																													
(4) Construction Start		94 FEB																																													

1. COMPONENT	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
AIR FORCE		

3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION
 VARIOUS LOCATIONS - WITHIN THE UNITED STATES

4. PROJECT TITLE	5. PROJECT NUMBER
PROJECTS \$1 MILLION AND UNDER	

<u>STATE AND LOCATION</u>	<u>PROJECT TITLE</u>	<u>COST (\$000)</u>
<u>OKLAHOMA</u>		
TINKER AFB (CSV) WWYK943030 131-132	MILSTAR COMMUNICATIONS GROUND TERMINAL	800
<p>Construct a Milstar Communications Ground Terminal support facility. (New Mission) A properly sized facility is required to house one 60 KW generator, an uninterruptible power supply (UPS) system and electrical switchgear that will be used to provide a continuous power source to the Milstar Communications Ground Terminal located in a nearby facility. Since this facility houses emergency power equipment, the facility must be designed to Milstar facility specifications. The Milstar system, via satellites, provides the National Command Authority (NCA) with the only worldwide, secure, two-way, anti-jam, survivable, low probability of detection/interception voice and data communication capability. The Milstar communications equipment will be located in an existing facility. However, that facility has no available space to house the standby generator and UPS. Without this project, critical connectivity between NORAD/Space Command and other high priority users, including the NCA, would be lost during crises and deny the ability to command and control military forces through all levels of conflict. The Milstar terminal equipment for this site is scheduled for delivery in 1996. There are no criteria for this project in Air Force Manual 86-2, Standard Facility Requirements," or in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide."</p>		

1. COMPONENT	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)		2. DATE
AIR FORCE			
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION			
TINKER AIR FORCE BASE, OKLAHOMA			
4. PROJECT TITLE		5. PROJECT NUMBER	
MILSTAR COMMUNICATIONS GROUND TERMINAL		WWYK943030	
12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:			
a. Estimated Design Data:			
(1) Status:			
(a) Date Design Started		92 NOV 01	
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%	
(c) Date 35% Designed		93 JAN 15	
(d) Date Design Complete		93 SEP 15	
(2) Basis:			
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO	
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A	
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e):			(\$000)
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications			48
(b) All Other Design Costs			42
(c) Total			90
(d) Contract			60
(e) In-house			30
(4) Construction Start		93 DEC	
b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations:			
EQUIPMENT NOMENCLATURE	PROCURING APPROPRIATION	FISCAL YEAR APPROPRIATED OR REQUESTED	COST (\$000)
MILSTAR TERMINAL EQUIPMENT	3080	FY 95	4200
EHF ANTENNA SUPPORT SHELTER	3080	FY 95	250
SOLID STATE UPS SYSTEM	3080	FY 95	200

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION VARIOUS LOCATIONS - WITHIN THE UNITED STATES		
4. PROJECT TITLE PROJECTS \$1 MILLION AND UNDER	5. PROJECT NUMBER	
<u>STATE AND LOCATION</u> <u>OKLAHOMA</u> TINKER AFB (MTC) WWYK880037 411-135	<u>PROJECT TITLE</u> SEAL FUEL CONTAINMENT DIKES	<u>COST</u> <u>(\$000)</u> 620
<p>Seal two fuel containment dikes. (Current Mission) This is a Level I environmental compliance requirement. Secondary containment around fuel storage areas is needed to contain all liquid petroleum which may spill from above-ground fuel storage tanks in event of tank rupture. The Federal Oil Pollution Prevention Regulation (40CFR, Section 112.7(e)(2)) requires impervious secondary containment for above ground tanks. This project is needed to seal the dikes and prevent the fuel from penetrating the ground or the dikes and polluting the soil and aquifer. Existing earthen dikes are not impervious and are coated with asphalt to reduce erosion. The base of the diked area is sand and gravel which permit leaching to the aquifer. The dikes cannot contain spilled fuel and do not meet criteria stated in the Federal Oil Pollution Prevention Regulation (Code of Federal Regulations, Title 40, Section 112) and comparable state laws. In event of a fuel spill, surrounding soil and the underlying aquifer will be quickly contaminated causing significant damage to the environment. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements".</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																																													
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION TINKER AIR FORCE BASE, OKLAHOMA																																															
4. PROJECT TITLE SEAL FUEL CONTAINMENT DIKES	5. PROJECT NUMBER WWYK880037																																														
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td colspan="3">(1) Status:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td></td> <td>92 JUN 25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td></td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td></td> <td>92 SEP 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td></td> <td>93 SEP 17</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(2) Basis:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td></td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td></td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td></td> <td>36</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td></td> <td>41</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td></td> <td>77</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td></td> <td>77</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(4) Construction Start</td> <td></td> <td>93 DEC</td> </tr> </table> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(1) Status:			(a) Date Design Started		92 JUN 25	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%	(c) Date 35% Designed		92 SEP 15	(d) Date Design Complete		93 SEP 17	(2) Basis:			(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A	(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)			(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		36	(b) All Other Design Costs		41	(c) Total		77	(d) Contract			(e) In-house		77	(4) Construction Start		93 DEC
(1) Status:																																															
(a) Date Design Started		92 JUN 25																																													
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%																																													
(c) Date 35% Designed		92 SEP 15																																													
(d) Date Design Complete		93 SEP 17																																													
(2) Basis:																																															
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO																																													
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A																																													
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)																																															
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		36																																													
(b) All Other Design Costs		41																																													
(c) Total		77																																													
(d) Contract																																															
(e) In-house		77																																													
(4) Construction Start		93 DEC																																													

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION VARIOUS LOCATIONS - WITHIN THE UNITED STATES		
4. PROJECT TITLE PROJECTS \$1 MILLION AND UNDER	5. PROJECT NUMBER	
<u>STATE AND LOCATION</u> <u>SOUTH CAROLINA</u> SHAW AFB (ACC) VLSB943007 411-135	<u>PROJECT TITLE</u> UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	<u>COST (\$000)</u> 520
<p>Upgrade/remove/replace underground storage tanks (USTs). (Current Mission) This is a Level II environmental compliance project. Upgrade/remove/replace approximately 57 regulated storage tank systems to meet requirements of 40 CFR 280. The Environmental Protection Agency has set standards that require all regulated tank systems to have leak detection, corrosion protection, and spill/overflow prevention systems. If tank systems are to be replaced, Air Force policy is to replace them with aboveground tanks or to relocate them into underground vaults, wherever possible. However, existing petroleum product storage tanks which are in good condition may be upgraded in place to bring them into compliance with applicable environmental regulations. Over the past 20 years tanks have been installed without cathodic protection, leak detection, and spill/overflow protection. These tanks must be upgraded in order to remain in service after December 1988. Removal, replacement, or upgrade in-place will be required to assure a leak-free environment and compliance with federal and state laws. Undetected tank releases can result in contamination of soil and ground water supplies, resulting in a threat to human health and the environment, along with extremely costly clean-up measures. These improvements to USTs are mandated by federal law. If not accomplished by December 1998, the base will be in violation of the law and subject to receiving Notices of Violation, fines, and significant adverse publicity. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements".</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																																													
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION SHAW AIR FORCE BASE, SOUTH CAROLINA																																															
4. PROJECT TITLE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	5. PROJECT NUMBER VLSB943007																																														
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <table data-bbox="297 588 1438 1176"> <tr> <td colspan="3">(1) Status:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td></td> <td>92 JUL 13</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td></td> <td>100%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td></td> <td>92 JUL 27</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td></td> <td>92 DEC 27</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(2) Basis:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td></td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td></td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td></td> <td>30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td></td> <td>23</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td></td> <td>53</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> <td>34</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td></td> <td>19</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(4) Construction Start</td> <td></td> <td>94 JAN</td> </tr> </table> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(1) Status:			(a) Date Design Started		92 JUL 13	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		100%	(c) Date 35% Designed		92 JUL 27	(d) Date Design Complete		92 DEC 27	(2) Basis:			(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A	(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)			(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		30	(b) All Other Design Costs		23	(c) Total		53	(d) Contract		34	(e) In-house		19	(4) Construction Start		94 JAN
(1) Status:																																															
(a) Date Design Started		92 JUL 13																																													
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		100%																																													
(c) Date 35% Designed		92 JUL 27																																													
(d) Date Design Complete		92 DEC 27																																													
(2) Basis:																																															
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO																																													
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A																																													
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)																																															
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		30																																													
(b) All Other Design Costs		23																																													
(c) Total		53																																													
(d) Contract		34																																													
(e) In-house		19																																													
(4) Construction Start		94 JAN																																													

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE												
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION VARIOUS LOCATIONS - WITHIN THE UNITED STATES														
4. PROJECT TITLE PROJECTS \$1 MILLION AND UNDER	5. PROJECT NUMBER													
<table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="214 504 512 535"><u>STATE AND LOCATION</u></th> <th data-bbox="718 504 933 535"><u>PROJECT TITLE</u></th> <th data-bbox="1313 472 1412 535"><u>COST (\$000)</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="3" data-bbox="214 567 421 598"><u>SOUTH DAKOTA</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="247 630 561 724">ELLSWORTH AFB (ACC) FXBM900177 211-173</td> <td data-bbox="718 630 1139 693">ALTER AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE DOCK</td> <td data-bbox="1346 630 1404 661">630</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3" data-bbox="214 756 1412 1522"> <p>Alter aircraft maintenance dock. (Current Mission) Aircraft maintenance activities require the capability to remove and replace heavy components on assigned aircraft. One hoist is required to operate on the tail area of aircraft, while another is required in the nose area. Structural modifications are necessary to support ceiling mounted cranes. The facility has no cranes or hoists to support maintenance and repair of large aircraft components. The facility is not structurally capable of supporting installation of needed cranes without modification. Aircraft maintenance personnel must rely on other base organizations to provide a mobile, vehicle mounted crane to support their requirements for heavy lifting. This requirement occurs at least once per week, and involves placement of a vehicle mounted crane inside the maintenance facility and in close proximity to an aircraft. The cranes are operated by individuals not accustomed to working in such confined areas where minor movements can cause costly damage to a facility or an aircraft. Since the mobile cranes are intended for other uses, they are not always readily available for "loan" to the aircraft maintenance function. When not available, aircraft maintenance schedules must be revised accordingly. The potential for costly damage to an aircraft or the interior of the maintenance dock will remain high. Maintenance delays will reduce aircraft readiness and mission execution capabilities. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements".</p> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			<u>STATE AND LOCATION</u>	<u>PROJECT TITLE</u>	<u>COST (\$000)</u>	<u>SOUTH DAKOTA</u>			ELLSWORTH AFB (ACC) FXBM900177 211-173	ALTER AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE DOCK	630	<p>Alter aircraft maintenance dock. (Current Mission) Aircraft maintenance activities require the capability to remove and replace heavy components on assigned aircraft. One hoist is required to operate on the tail area of aircraft, while another is required in the nose area. Structural modifications are necessary to support ceiling mounted cranes. The facility has no cranes or hoists to support maintenance and repair of large aircraft components. The facility is not structurally capable of supporting installation of needed cranes without modification. Aircraft maintenance personnel must rely on other base organizations to provide a mobile, vehicle mounted crane to support their requirements for heavy lifting. This requirement occurs at least once per week, and involves placement of a vehicle mounted crane inside the maintenance facility and in close proximity to an aircraft. The cranes are operated by individuals not accustomed to working in such confined areas where minor movements can cause costly damage to a facility or an aircraft. Since the mobile cranes are intended for other uses, they are not always readily available for "loan" to the aircraft maintenance function. When not available, aircraft maintenance schedules must be revised accordingly. The potential for costly damage to an aircraft or the interior of the maintenance dock will remain high. Maintenance delays will reduce aircraft readiness and mission execution capabilities. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements".</p>		
<u>STATE AND LOCATION</u>	<u>PROJECT TITLE</u>	<u>COST (\$000)</u>												
<u>SOUTH DAKOTA</u>														
ELLSWORTH AFB (ACC) FXBM900177 211-173	ALTER AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE DOCK	630												
<p>Alter aircraft maintenance dock. (Current Mission) Aircraft maintenance activities require the capability to remove and replace heavy components on assigned aircraft. One hoist is required to operate on the tail area of aircraft, while another is required in the nose area. Structural modifications are necessary to support ceiling mounted cranes. The facility has no cranes or hoists to support maintenance and repair of large aircraft components. The facility is not structurally capable of supporting installation of needed cranes without modification. Aircraft maintenance personnel must rely on other base organizations to provide a mobile, vehicle mounted crane to support their requirements for heavy lifting. This requirement occurs at least once per week, and involves placement of a vehicle mounted crane inside the maintenance facility and in close proximity to an aircraft. The cranes are operated by individuals not accustomed to working in such confined areas where minor movements can cause costly damage to a facility or an aircraft. Since the mobile cranes are intended for other uses, they are not always readily available for "loan" to the aircraft maintenance function. When not available, aircraft maintenance schedules must be revised accordingly. The potential for costly damage to an aircraft or the interior of the maintenance dock will remain high. Maintenance delays will reduce aircraft readiness and mission execution capabilities. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements".</p>														

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ELLSWORTH AIR FORCE BASE, SOUTH DAKOTA																								
4. PROJECT TITLE ALTER AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE DOCK	5. PROJECT NUMBER FXBM900177																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="371 632 1435 762"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 AUG 20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 OCT 20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 APR 30</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="371 825 1435 888"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="371 951 1435 1108"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>35</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>75</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 AUG 20	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 OCT 20	(d) Date Design Complete	93 APR 30	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	35	(b) All Other Design Costs	40	(c) Total	75	(d) Contract		(e) In-house	75
(a) Date Design Started	92 AUG 20																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 OCT 20																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 APR 30																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	35																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	40																							
(c) Total	75																							
(d) Contract																								
(e) In-house	75																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION VARIOUS LOCATIONS - WITHIN THE UNITED STATES		
4. PROJECT TITLE PROJECTS \$1 MILLION AND UNDER	5. PROJECT NUMBER	
<u>STATE AND LOCATION</u> <u>TEXAS</u> DYESS AFB (ACC) FNWZ953001 872-247	<u>PROJECT TITLE</u> WEAPONS STORAGE AREA SECURITY	<u>COST</u> <u>(\$000)</u> 890
<p>Upgrade weapons storage area security. (Current Mission) Adequate Weapons Storage Area (WSA) security to deter or delay intrusion and meet Department of Defense (DOD) protection criteria as identified in DOD Manual 5210.41. Department of Defense guidelines for security of Weapons Storage Areas require specific fence heights, and anchoring and stabilizing systems to ensure the integrity of security devices. A "double fence" system is required which includes an outer six-foot-high animal control fence to reduce false alarms from security sensors, and an inner seven-foot-high (plus outrigger) security fence on which sensors are mounted. Inner fences must be capable of supporting installation of second generation Fence Protection System sensors scheduled for installation in the future. All WSAs also require interior and exterior all-weather access to meet a five-minute response time for any security alarm or incident. This project corrects a nuclear surety deficiency. The existing fence does not meet DOD standards for fence height and is improperly constructed to meet security requirements. The surrounding clear zone is not properly graded. Soil around the fence has eroded in some areas leaving openings beneath the fence, and has accumulated in other areas resulting in inadequate fence height. The fence is old and will not support installation of new second generation Fence Protection System sensors scheduled to be installed in May 1995 at a cost of \$1.2M. This project will eliminate three DOD nuclear security/surety waivers and variances. Security for critical and sensitive munitions assets will not meet DOD requirements. Waivers will be required to continue use of the WSA. If waivers cannot be obtained, the base mission cannot be executed. Installation of second generation security sensors will be delayed until an adequate interior fence is provided. Security for munitions will be jeopardized, with possible major consequences and adverse publicity should the area be penetrated by unauthorized personnel. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements".</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																																		
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION DYESS AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS																																				
4. PROJECT TITLE WEAPONS STORAGE AREA SECURITY	5. PROJECT NUMBER FNWZ953001																																			
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="370 638 1427 764"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 JUL 10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 SEP 04</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 JUL 18</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="370 827 1334 890"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="370 953 1417 1121"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>48</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>16</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>64</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>54</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>10</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations:</p> <table data-bbox="204 1402 1417 1625"> <thead> <tr> <th>EQUIPMENT NOMENCLATURE</th> <th>PROCURING APPROPRIATION</th> <th>FISCAL YEAR APPROPRIATED OR REQUESTED</th> <th>COST (\$000)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>DTR 90 VERTICAL TAUGHT WIRE</td> <td>3400</td> <td>94</td> <td>882</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SENSORS/FENCE PROTECTIONS SYSTEM-2</td> <td>3080</td> <td>94</td> <td>318</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			(a) Date Design Started	92 JUL 10	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 SEP 04	(d) Date Design Complete	93 JUL 18	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	48	(b) All Other Design Costs	16	(c) Total	64	(d) Contract	54	(e) In-house	10	EQUIPMENT NOMENCLATURE	PROCURING APPROPRIATION	FISCAL YEAR APPROPRIATED OR REQUESTED	COST (\$000)	DTR 90 VERTICAL TAUGHT WIRE	3400	94	882	SENSORS/FENCE PROTECTIONS SYSTEM-2	3080	94	318
(a) Date Design Started	92 JUL 10																																			
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																																			
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 SEP 04																																			
(d) Date Design Complete	93 JUL 18																																			
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																																			
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																																			
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	48																																			
(b) All Other Design Costs	16																																			
(c) Total	64																																			
(d) Contract	54																																			
(e) In-house	10																																			
EQUIPMENT NOMENCLATURE	PROCURING APPROPRIATION	FISCAL YEAR APPROPRIATED OR REQUESTED	COST (\$000)																																	
DTR 90 VERTICAL TAUGHT WIRE	3400	94	882																																	
SENSORS/FENCE PROTECTIONS SYSTEM-2	3080	94	318																																	

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION VARIOUS LOCATIONS - WITHIN THE UNITED STATES		
4. PROJECT TITLE PROJECTS \$1 MILLION AND UNDER	5. PROJECT NUMBER	
<u>STATE AND LOCATION</u> <u>TEXAS</u> KELLY AFB (MTC) MBPB933003 217-712	<u>PROJECT TITLE</u> C-17 ALTER DEPOT AVIONICS FACILITY (DBOF)	<u>COST (\$000)</u> 731
<p>Alter a C-17 depot avionics facility. (New Mission) A suitable facility is required to provide a completely organic capability for depot repair and test of C-17 avionics systems and components to maintain combat readiness. Environmentally controlled areas for test and overhaul of shop-repairable components, radar and antenna array and radomes are required. Under the C-17 concept, the depot must also establish an avionics intermediate shop which will be used to test and repair line-replaceable units as well as some software associated with avionics. Minor alterations to an existing building are needed to satisfy this requirement. Even though the existing depot avionics shops are utilized to near capacity, reductions in other workloads will make space available to accommodate the C-17 workload within existing space; however, some of that space will have to be modified to accommodate state-of-the-art technologies associated with the C-17. Deficiencies include inadequate lighting, unconditioned electrical power and inadequate noise abatement. Most of the avionics support for the C-17 will have to be contracted out at greatly increased costs. More importantly, the divided repair responsibility will result in significant delays in completion of depot repairs and return of aircraft to operational units. The requirement for this project was validated by the Joint Service Depot Maintenance Industrial Military Construction Review Panel in May 1990. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide", or in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements".</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION KELLY AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS			
4. PROJECT TITLE C-17 ALTER DEPOT AVIONICS FACILITY (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER MBPB933003		
12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:			
a. Estimated Design Data:			
(1) Status:			
(a) Date Design Started		92 SEP 05	
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%	
(c) Date 35% Designed		92 NOV 20	
(d) Date Design Complete		93 OCT 14	
(2) Basis:			
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO	
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A	
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)			
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		43	
(b) All Other Design Costs		66	
(c) Total		109	
(d) Contract		56	
(e) In-house		53	
(4) Construction Start		93 DEC	
b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations:			
EQUIPMENT NOMENCLATURE	PROCURING APPROPRIATION	FISCAL YEAR APPROPRIATED OR REQUESTED	COST (\$000)
13 SHOP REPLACEABLE UNIT TEST EQUIPMENT	3010	FY94	15400

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION VARIOUS LOCATIONS - WITHIN THE UNITED STATES		
4. PROJECT TITLE PROJECTS \$1 MILLION AND UNDER	5. PROJECT NUMBER	
<u>STATE AND LOCATION</u> <u>TEXAS</u> REESE AFB (ATC) UBNY953002 411-135	<u>PROJECT TITLE</u> UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	<u>COST (\$000)</u> 900
<p>Upgrade or replace existing underground storage tanks. (Current Mission) This is a Level II environmental compliance project. Upgrade all underground storage tanks (USTs) regulated by Title 40 Code of Federal Regulations, part 280 to new Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) standards. The EPA has set standards requiring all USTs to have leak detection, corrosion protection, and spill and overfill prevention systems by December 1998. Further, the 31 Texas Administrative Code, Chapter 334 requires spill and overfill prevention measures be installed by December 1994. Existing USTs must be upgraded to comply with new standards, replaced with new UST systems, or replaced with aboveground tanks. This project includes USTs used to store fuel for emergency power generation which are deferred by federal regulations, but are regulated in the state of Texas as per 31 Texas Administrative Code, Chapter 334. USTs have to be leak tested annually until they are upgraded with permanent leak detection systems. Testing costs are estimated at \$1,000 per UST. Installation of permanent leak detection systems will eliminate recurring testing costs. In addition, the various upgrades will also help prevent releases which could result in future AF liability and expensive cleanup costs. Command wide testing activities accomplished to date indicate a leak test failure rate of approximately 5%. USTs included in this project support transportation, POL operations, AGE operations, power production, and aircraft maintenance. Potential shutdown of mission essential facilities as leaks occur. Annual expenditure of \$29K for tank inspections. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements".</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION REESE AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS																								
4. PROJECT TITLE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	5. PROJECT NUMBER UBNY953002																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="360 638 1410 764"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 JUL 24</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 OCT 24</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 SEP 15</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="360 831 1356 894"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>YES</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>REESE</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="360 957 1405 1115"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>70</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>120</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>120</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 JAN</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 JUL 24	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 OCT 24	(d) Date Design Complete	93 SEP 15	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	YES	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	REESE	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	50	(b) All Other Design Costs	70	(c) Total	120	(d) Contract		(e) In-house	120
(a) Date Design Started	92 JUL 24																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 OCT 24																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 SEP 15																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	YES																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	REESE																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	50																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	70																							
(c) Total	120																							
(d) Contract																								
(e) In-house	120																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION VARIOUS LOCATIONS - WITHIN THE UNITED STATES		
4. PROJECT TITLE PROJECTS \$1 MILLION AND UNDER	5. PROJECT NUMBER	
<u>STATE AND LOCATION</u> <u>TEXAS</u> SHEPPARD AFB (ATC) VNVP953003 179-511	<u>PROJECT TITLE</u> FIRE TRAINING FACILITY	<u>COST</u> <u>(\$000)</u> 850
<p>Construct a fire training facility. (Current Mission) This is a Level I environmental compliance project which will correct violations of existing statutes. A live fire training facility meeting all environmental and safety regulations. Live fire training exercises, an FAA quarterly requirement, enable fire fighters to maintain a high level of proficiency by extinguishing two types of live fires: mass fuel spills and three dimensional (running fuel) fires. These exercises, performed on mock-ups typical of the mission assigned aircraft, have historically created compliance problems with the Clean Water Act. An impermeable lining below the pit area is required to prevent waste oils and fuels from leaching into the ground and to prevent groundwater from becoming contaminated by residual unburned fuel. The existing site is designated as an Installation Restoration Program (IRP) site undergoing remedial investigation funded by Defense Environmental Restoration Account (DERA). Current facility is not environmentally acceptable for fire training purposes. Fire fighters will not remain proficient in aircraft crash fire fighting and rescue techniques. The safety of both firefighters and accident victims will continue to be compromised. TDY training is not feasible due to funded level of manning and mission support requirements. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements".</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION SHEPPARD AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS																								
4. PROJECT TITLE FIRE TRAINING FACILITY	5. PROJECT NUMBER VNVP953003																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="355 630 1428 766"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 SEP 29</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 DEC 29</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 NOV 01</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="355 819 1428 892"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>YES</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>REESE</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="355 945 1428 1113"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>26</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>76</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>57</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>19</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 FEB</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 SEP 29	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 DEC 29	(d) Date Design Complete	93 NOV 01	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	YES	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	REESE	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	50	(b) All Other Design Costs	26	(c) Total	76	(d) Contract	57	(e) In-house	19
(a) Date Design Started	92 SEP 29																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 DEC 29																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 NOV 01																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	YES																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	REESE																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	50																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	26																							
(c) Total	76																							
(d) Contract	57																							
(e) In-house	19																							

1. COMPONENT	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
--------------	--	---------

3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION
VARIOUS LOCATIONS - WITHIN THE UNITED STATES

4. PROJECT TITLE	5. PROJECT NUMBER
------------------	-------------------

PROJECTS \$1 MILLION AND UNDER

<u>STATE AND LOCATION</u>	<u>PROJECT TITLE</u>	<u>COST (\$000)</u>
<u>TEXAS</u>		
SHEPPARD AFB (ATC) VNVP963001 740-884	ADD TO AND ALTER CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	780
<p>Add to and alter child development center. (Current Mission) A properly sized and functionally configured facility is required to provide supervised care and development experience for 327 dependent children ages four weeks through twelve years, including all preschool activities. Adequate child care facilities must be provided to accommodate the special requirements placed on military families, single parents and working spouses. The facility programs offered must provide professional care, operate during nonstandard hours, provide for services on an hourly, daily or part-time basis and provide early developmental care for children. The present center was constructed in 1973 to accommodate 140 children. Two additions have been constructed, in 1987 and 1990, to accommodate 44 additional children. Presently two WWII facilities are being used to supplement an additional 60 children which relieves only some of the pressure of lack of space. These two additional facilities are wood framed, contain asbestos, and have no central HVAC/environmental controls. One building has inadequate toilet facilities without privacy for the children, no indoor multi-purpose space, no kitchen facilities, and miscellaneous deficiencies such as extremely limited storage and administrative/staff capabilities. Those families turned away use off-base programs of which not all are licensed, do not accommodate all ages, and do not accommodate working hours of base personnel. Personnel must continue to use off base programs or place children in unlicensed babysitting situations and the morale, productivity and career satisfaction of service members will continue to be degraded. Lack of adequate space hinders the implementation of expanding the drop-in care program. Requirements do not include calculations based upon mission gains related to base realignment and closure (BRAC). A FY 94 BRAC project VNVP933021, with a scope of 5,000 SF, has been submitted and should be incorporated into this project. This project meets the criteria/scope specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide".</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION SHEPPARD AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS																								
4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO AND ALTER CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	5. PROJECT NUMBER VNVP963001																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="360 632 1410 762"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 JUL 17</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 OCT 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 DEC 18</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="360 825 1410 888"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>YES</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>SHEPPARD</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="360 951 1410 1108"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>46</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>76</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>66</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>10</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 MAR</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 JUL 17	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 OCT 15	(d) Date Design Complete	93 DEC 18	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	YES	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	SHEPPARD	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	46	(b) All Other Design Costs	30	(c) Total	76	(d) Contract	66	(e) In-house	10
(a) Date Design Started	92 JUL 17																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 OCT 15																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 DEC 18																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	YES																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	SHEPPARD																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	46																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	30																							
(c) Total	76																							
(d) Contract	66																							
(e) In-house	10																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION VARIOUS LOCATIONS - WITHIN THE UNITED STATES		
4. PROJECT TITLE PROJECTS \$1 MILLION AND UNDER	5. PROJECT NUMBER	
<u>STATE AND LOCATION</u> <u>UTAH</u> HILL AFB (MTC) KRS933019 179-511	<u>PROJECT TITLE</u> FIRE TRAINING FACILITY (DBOF)	<u>COST (\$000)</u> 880
<p>Construct a fire training facility. (Current Mission) This is a Level I environmental compliance project which will correct violations of existing statutes. A live fire training facility meeting all environmental and safety regulations is required. FAA requires quarterly live fire training exercises to enable fire fighters to maintain a high level of proficiency by extinguishing two types of live fires: mass fuel spills and three dimensional (running fuel) fires. These exercises, performed on mock-ups typical of the mission assigned aircraft, have historically created compliance problems with the Clean Water Act. An impermeable lining below the pit area is required to prevent waste oils and fuels from leaching into the ground and to prevent groundwater from becoming contaminated by residual unburned fuel. The live fire training facility at this base does not meet the standards established for this type of facility by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). While this facility is currently used on a limited basis, the lining and other environmental control measures do not meet requirements of the new Clean Water Act. Alternative training methods have been considered, but all have proven non-productive. Off-base training is not acceptable since it would remove both the crews and fire vehicles from the base, making them unavailable for response to emergencies. Base fire crews will continue to be denied FAA required live fire training, adversely impacting their degree of readiness. Lack of training could result in injury, loss of life, or loss of an aircraft. There is no criteria/scope for this project in either Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide" or AFM 86-2.</p>		

1. COMPONENT	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
AIR FORCE		
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION		
HILL AIR FORCE BASE, UTAH		
4. PROJECT TITLE		5. PROJECT NUMBER
FIRE TRAINING FACILITY (DBOF)		KRSM933019
12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:		
a. Estimated Design Data:		
(1) Status:		
(a) Date Design Started		92 JUL 15
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%
(c) Date 35% Designed		92 OCT 21
(d) Date Design Complete		93 SEP 15
(2) Basis:		
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		YES
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		MT HOME
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)		
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		53
(b) All Other Design Costs		60
(c) Total		113
(d) Contract		47
(e) In-house		66
(4) Construction Start		93 DEC
b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION VARIOUS LOCATIONS - WITHIN THE UNITED STATES		
4. PROJECT TITLE PROJECTS \$1 MILLION AND UNDER	5. PROJECT NUMBER	
<u>STATE AND LOCATION</u> <u>VIRGINIA</u> LANGLEY AFB (ACC) MUHJ943009 411-135	<u>PROJECT TITLE</u> UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	<u>COST (\$000)</u> 500
<p>Remove/replace underground storage tanks (USTs). (Current Mission) This is a Level II environmental compliance project. Adequate fuel storage, properly designed and located, is required to satisfy base mission requirements. All petroleum dispensing and operating facilities must be provided with a means for detecting and preventing release of pollutants into the surrounding environment. All USTs must be upgraded in accordance with federal law (40 CFR 280.21) by December 1998. This includes leak detection, corrosion protection, and spill/overflow prevention systems to protect human health and the environment. Underground storage tanks at Langley AFB do not meet federal requirements for corrosion protection, secondary containment, and overfill/spill protection. The condition of these tanks varies with a majority of the tanks at or exceeding their design life. These deficiencies must be corrected to prevent violation of federal UST regulations. If underground storage tanks require replacement, Air Force policy is to replace them with aboveground tanks or relocate them into underground vaults, whenever possible. Undetected UST releases can result in contamination of soil and ground water supplies, resulting in a threat to human health and the environment along with extremely costly cleanup measures. These improvements to USTs are mandated by federal law. If not accomplished by the established deadline, the base will be in violation of the law and subject to receiving Notices of Violation, fines and significant adverse publicity. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements".</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																																													
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION LANGLEY AIR FORCE BASE, VIRGINIA																																															
4. PROJECT TITLE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS	5. PROJECT NUMBER MUHJ943009																																														
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <table data-bbox="310 604 1433 1176"> <tr> <td colspan="3">(1) Status:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td></td> <td>92 NOV 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td></td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td></td> <td>92 DEC 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td></td> <td>93 AUG 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(2) Basis:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td></td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td></td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td></td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td></td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td></td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(4) Construction Start</td> <td></td> <td>93 DEC</td> </tr> </table> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(1) Status:			(a) Date Design Started		92 NOV 01	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%	(c) Date 35% Designed		92 DEC 15	(d) Date Design Complete		93 AUG 01	(2) Basis:			(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A	(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)			(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		5	(b) All Other Design Costs			(c) Total		5	(d) Contract			(e) In-house		5	(4) Construction Start		93 DEC
(1) Status:																																															
(a) Date Design Started		92 NOV 01																																													
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%																																													
(c) Date 35% Designed		92 DEC 15																																													
(d) Date Design Complete		93 AUG 01																																													
(2) Basis:																																															
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO																																													
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A																																													
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)																																															
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		5																																													
(b) All Other Design Costs																																															
(c) Total		5																																													
(d) Contract																																															
(e) In-house		5																																													
(4) Construction Start		93 DEC																																													

1. COMPONENT	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
AIR FORCE		
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION		
VARIOUS LOCATIONS - WITHIN THE UNITED STATES		
4. PROJECT TITLE	5. PROJECT NUMBER	
PROJECTS \$1 MILLION AND UNDER		

<u>STATE AND LOCATION</u>	<u>PROJECT TITLE</u>	<u>COST (\$000)</u>
<u>WYOMING</u>		
F E WARREN AFB (ACC) GHLN931001 851-147	WEAPONS STORAGE AREA SECURITY	640
<p>Weapons storage area security improvements. (Current Mission) Adequate Weapons Storage Area (WSA) security to deter or delay intrusion and meet Department of Defense (DOD) protection criteria as identified in DOD Manual 5210.41. Department of Defense guidelines for security of Weapons Storage Areas require specific fence heights and anchoring and stabilizing systems to ensure the integrity of security devices. A "double fence" system is required which includes an outer six-foot-high animal control fence to reduce false alarms from security sensors. An inner seven-foot-high (plus outrigger) security fence on which sensors are mounted is also required. Inner fences must be capable of supporting installation of second generation Fence Protection System sensors scheduled for installation in the future. All WSAs also require interior and exterior all-weather vehicle access to permit a five-minute response time for any security alarm or incident. A weather shelter is required for personnel entrapment areas to protect individuals awaiting entry to or exit from the secure area. This project corrects a nuclear surety deficiency. The existing interior security fence does not meet DOD standards for fence height. To compensate for fence height deficiencies, security forces must physically inspect the entire perimeter every four hours instead of the normal once per shift. During the winter or wet weather, these inspections are conducted on foot, as the perimeter patrol roads are impassable by vehicle. During these "foot patrols", security forces are removed from optimum locations for responding to security alarms, and are unable to respond within the required five minutes. The interior fence is old, and will also not support installation of new second generation Fence Protection System sensors scheduled to be installed in FY 94 at a cost of \$1.2M. The WSA has no shelter to protect personnel from sub-zero temperatures, blowing snow, and other inclement weather as they enter and leave the area. These individuals are fully exposed to the weather while in the security entrapment area awaiting clearance to proceed. This causes extreme hardships for the 600 individuals entering and exiting the area each day. This project will eliminate one DOD nuclear security/surety waiver. Security for critical and sensitive munitions will not meet DOD requirements. A waiver will be required to continue use of the WSA. If waivers cannot be obtained, the base mission cannot be executed. Installation of second generation security sensors will be delayed until an adequate interior fence is provided. Security for munitions will be jeopardized, with possible major</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION VARIOUS LOCATIONS - WITHIN THE UNITED STATES								
4. PROJECT TITLE PROJECTS \$1 MILLION AND UNDER	5. PROJECT NUMBER							
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="219 506 515 537"><u>STATE AND LOCATION</u></th> <th data-bbox="720 506 933 537"><u>PROJECT TITLE</u></th> <th data-bbox="1318 474 1414 537"><u>COST (\$000)</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="3" data-bbox="219 569 1414 793"> <p>consequences and adverse publicity should the area be penetrated by unauthorized personnel. Personnel will have to endure severe weather hardships as they await and undergo security checks prior to entering or exiting this secure area. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements".</p> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			<u>STATE AND LOCATION</u>	<u>PROJECT TITLE</u>	<u>COST (\$000)</u>	<p>consequences and adverse publicity should the area be penetrated by unauthorized personnel. Personnel will have to endure severe weather hardships as they await and undergo security checks prior to entering or exiting this secure area. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements".</p>		
<u>STATE AND LOCATION</u>	<u>PROJECT TITLE</u>	<u>COST (\$000)</u>						
<p>consequences and adverse publicity should the area be penetrated by unauthorized personnel. Personnel will have to endure severe weather hardships as they await and undergo security checks prior to entering or exiting this secure area. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements".</p>								

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION F E WARREN AIR FORCE BASE, WYOMING			
4. PROJECT TITLE WEAPONS STORAGE AREA SECURITY	5. PROJECT NUMBER GHLN931001		
12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:			
a. Estimated Design Data:			
(1) Status:			
(a) Date Design Started		92 SEP 01	
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%	
(c) Date 35% Designed		92 NOV 01	
(d) Date Design Complete		93 MAY 01	
(2) Basis:			
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO	
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A	
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)			
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		24	
(b) All Other Design Costs		56	
(c) Total		80	
(d) Contract			
(e) In-house		80	
(4) Construction Start		93 DEC	
b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations:			
EQUIPMENT NOMENCLATURE	PROCURING APPPOPRIATION	FISCAL YEAR APPROPRIATED OR REQUESTED	COST (\$000)
DTR 90 VERTICAL TAUT WIRE SENSORS FENCE PROTECTION SYSTEM-2			1200

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE												
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION VARIOUS LOCATIONS - OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES														
4. PROJECT TITLE PROJECTS \$1 MILLION AND UNDER	5. PROJECT NUMBER													
<table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="221 512 546 541"><u>COUNTRY AND LOCATION</u></th> <th data-bbox="720 512 931 541"><u>PROJECT TITLE</u></th> <th data-bbox="1318 478 1414 541"><u>COST (\$000)</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="3" data-bbox="221 575 629 604"><u>INVALID STATE ABBREVIATION</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="254 638 513 730">ANTIGUA AS (SPC) ALMY953007 811-145</td> <td data-bbox="720 638 1191 667">SLFI-UPGRADE BACKUP GENERATOR</td> <td data-bbox="1334 638 1400 667">1000</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3" data-bbox="221 764 1414 1619"> <p>Provide additional backup power for the Consolidated Instrumentation Facility (CIF). (Current Mission) This is a Space Launch Facilities Infrastructure (SLFI) requirement. Backup power is required for the tracking radar to support launch operations. In the event of power interruptions, a reliable source of backup power is required for the CIF to sustain critical spacelift launch support. The Antigua site provides tracking and telemetry spacelift launch support for the Global Positioning System, Defense Satellite Communications System, Space Shuttle, classified missions, and space and ballistic missile tests. The existing generators provide power for critical loads at the antenna, but there is no backup generator to power critical electronic and support equipment in the CIF. The prime power plant is 33 years old, and will continue to suffer from unavoidable power outages. Power outages can result in launch delays or, during a launch, tracking and telemetry support can be lost. There were three power outages last year and numerous power fluctuations. Had these outages or fluctuations occurred during a launch the result would have been a delay of the launch or loss of contact with the launch vehicle during the launch. Launch delays can impact the mission through failure to meet specific in-orbit timelines and are costly in terms of overtime for the contractor. Telemetry and tracking are critical to attaining correct orbit; failure to do so can result in loss of the launch vehicle and its payload. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide" or AFM 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements". High cost at this site is due to its location on a remote island that requires shipping of materials and equipment by boat, and because construction contractors must provide temporary housing for workers.</p> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			<u>COUNTRY AND LOCATION</u>	<u>PROJECT TITLE</u>	<u>COST (\$000)</u>	<u>INVALID STATE ABBREVIATION</u>			ANTIGUA AS (SPC) ALMY953007 811-145	SLFI-UPGRADE BACKUP GENERATOR	1000	<p>Provide additional backup power for the Consolidated Instrumentation Facility (CIF). (Current Mission) This is a Space Launch Facilities Infrastructure (SLFI) requirement. Backup power is required for the tracking radar to support launch operations. In the event of power interruptions, a reliable source of backup power is required for the CIF to sustain critical spacelift launch support. The Antigua site provides tracking and telemetry spacelift launch support for the Global Positioning System, Defense Satellite Communications System, Space Shuttle, classified missions, and space and ballistic missile tests. The existing generators provide power for critical loads at the antenna, but there is no backup generator to power critical electronic and support equipment in the CIF. The prime power plant is 33 years old, and will continue to suffer from unavoidable power outages. Power outages can result in launch delays or, during a launch, tracking and telemetry support can be lost. There were three power outages last year and numerous power fluctuations. Had these outages or fluctuations occurred during a launch the result would have been a delay of the launch or loss of contact with the launch vehicle during the launch. Launch delays can impact the mission through failure to meet specific in-orbit timelines and are costly in terms of overtime for the contractor. Telemetry and tracking are critical to attaining correct orbit; failure to do so can result in loss of the launch vehicle and its payload. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide" or AFM 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements". High cost at this site is due to its location on a remote island that requires shipping of materials and equipment by boat, and because construction contractors must provide temporary housing for workers.</p>		
<u>COUNTRY AND LOCATION</u>	<u>PROJECT TITLE</u>	<u>COST (\$000)</u>												
<u>INVALID STATE ABBREVIATION</u>														
ANTIGUA AS (SPC) ALMY953007 811-145	SLFI-UPGRADE BACKUP GENERATOR	1000												
<p>Provide additional backup power for the Consolidated Instrumentation Facility (CIF). (Current Mission) This is a Space Launch Facilities Infrastructure (SLFI) requirement. Backup power is required for the tracking radar to support launch operations. In the event of power interruptions, a reliable source of backup power is required for the CIF to sustain critical spacelift launch support. The Antigua site provides tracking and telemetry spacelift launch support for the Global Positioning System, Defense Satellite Communications System, Space Shuttle, classified missions, and space and ballistic missile tests. The existing generators provide power for critical loads at the antenna, but there is no backup generator to power critical electronic and support equipment in the CIF. The prime power plant is 33 years old, and will continue to suffer from unavoidable power outages. Power outages can result in launch delays or, during a launch, tracking and telemetry support can be lost. There were three power outages last year and numerous power fluctuations. Had these outages or fluctuations occurred during a launch the result would have been a delay of the launch or loss of contact with the launch vehicle during the launch. Launch delays can impact the mission through failure to meet specific in-orbit timelines and are costly in terms of overtime for the contractor. Telemetry and tracking are critical to attaining correct orbit; failure to do so can result in loss of the launch vehicle and its payload. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide" or AFM 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements". High cost at this site is due to its location on a remote island that requires shipping of materials and equipment by boat, and because construction contractors must provide temporary housing for workers.</p>														

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ANTIGUA AIR STATION, ANTIGUA, WEST INDIES																								
4. PROJECT TITLE SLFI-UPGRADE BACKUP GENERATOR	5. PROJECT NUMBER ALMY953007																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="360 638 1410 764"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 DEC 08</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 DEC 24</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 JUL 01</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="360 827 1328 890"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="360 953 1410 1113"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>60</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>90</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>15</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 DEC 08	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 DEC 24	(d) Date Design Complete	93 JUL 01	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	60	(b) All Other Design Costs	30	(c) Total	90	(d) Contract	75	(e) In-house	15
(a) Date Design Started	92 DEC 08																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 DEC 24																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 JUL 01																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	60																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	30																							
(c) Total	90																							
(d) Contract	75																							
(e) In-house	15																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION		
VARIOUS LOCATIONS - OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES		
4. PROJECT TITLE PROJECTS \$1 MILLION AND UNDER	5. PROJECT NUMBER	
<u>COUNTRY AND LOCATION</u>	<u>PROJECT TITLE</u>	<u>COST (\$000)</u>
<u>CLASSIFIED LOCATION</u>		
DIEGO GARCIA AB (SPC) FGDA943002 219-946	SATELLITE TRACKING STORAGE FACILITY	560
<p>Construct a satellite tracking storage facility. (Current Mission) An air conditioned storage and work facility is required to protect expensive technical and utility equipment spares from inclement weather and to provide work space for facilities personnel. When the Diego Garcia Automated Remote Tracking System (ARTS) facility was first installed, little or no administrative and storage space was provided for Air Force and contractor personnel. Although a pre-engineered office facility was added, no office space, maintenance workspace, or storage space was included. Facilities maintenance personnel are required to work outdoors which is ineffective due to the corrosive environment and frequent rain (over 100 inches/year). Most supplies are surface shipped to Diego Garcia and, because of its remote location in the central Indian Ocean and lead time of 6 months to a year, it is necessary for the installation to increase stock levels on many items. Recent closure of overseas support facilities such as Clark AFB has further degraded logistical support. As a result some materials are stored outside and others are stacked up inside inadequate space. The original technical supply area was also undersized. Spare magnetic tapes, electronics hardware, and other mission-related equipment is stored inefficiently and unsafely because of the congested conditions. Utility equipment will continue to be stored in hot, humid temporary storage facilities and will corrode in the aggressive salt atmosphere. The facilities manager will have inadequate space to store drawings, manuals, etc., and be unable to conduct repairs of utility equipment in a proper working environment. Technical equipment will continue to be stored in overcrowded and unsafe conditions. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements".</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION DIEGO GARCIA AIR BASE, INDIAN OCEAN																								
4. PROJECT TITLE SATELLITE TRACKING STORAGE FACILITY	5. PROJECT NUMBER FGDA943002																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 NOV 09</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 DEC 30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 SEP 01</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>34</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>16</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>42</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>8</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 NOV 09	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 DEC 30	(d) Date Design Complete	93 SEP 01	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	34	(b) All Other Design Costs	16	(c) Total	50	(d) Contract	42	(e) In-house	8
(a) Date Design Started	92 NOV 09																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 DEC 30																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 SEP 01																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	34																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	16																							
(c) Total	50																							
(d) Contract	42																							
(e) In-house	8																							

**DEFENSE BUSINESS OPERATIONS FUND
(DBOF)**

**THE FOLLOWING IS A SPECIAL SECTION ON DBOF
PROJECTS THAT ARE INCLUDED IN THE AIR FORCE
FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST.
THESE PROJECTS ARE ALSO INCLUDED IN THE
DD FORMS 1390 AND 1391 THAT ARE IN THE FRONT
PART OF THIS VOLUME.**

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
INDEX
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 1994
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)
DEFENSE BUSINESS OPERATIONS FUND

<u>STATE/COUNTRY</u> <u>INSTALLATION</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>PROJECT</u> <u>AUTH</u>	<u>AUTH</u> <u>FOR</u> <u>APPROP</u>	<u>APPROP</u> <u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
ARKANSAS					
LITTLE ROCK AFB					
	ADD/ALTER ENGINE INSPECTION AND REPAIR SHOP (DBOF)	1,200	1,200	1,200	661A
	ADD TO AND ALTER CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER (DBOF)	2,250	2,250	2,250	662
CALIFORNIA					
MCCLELLAN AFB					
	FIRE PROTECTION AIRCRAFT FACILITIES (DBOF)	1,900	1,900	1,900	665
TRAVIS AFB					
	UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS (DBOF)	2,840	2,840	2,840	666A
DELAWARE					
DOVER AFB					
	DORMITORY (DBOF)	3,200	3,200	3,200	667
	ADD TO AND ALTER DINING FACILITY (DBOF)	2,500	2,500	2,500	670
GEORGIA					
ROBINS AFB					
	ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES (DBOF)	4,300	4,300	4,300	673
ILLINOIS					
SCOTT AFB					
	MUNITIONS STORAGE FACILITY/ LAND ACQUISITION (DBOF)	2,450	2,450	2,450	676
MARYLAND					
ANDREWS AFB					
	AIR FREIGHT TERMINAL (DBOF)	4,400	4,400	4,400	678A
	FIRE TRAINING FACILITY (DBOF)	1,000	1,000	1,000	681
	UPGRADE COMPOSITE ADMINISTRATION FACILITY (DBOF)	9,940	9,940	9,940	682

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
INDEX
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 1994
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)
DEFENSE BUSINESS OPERATIONS FUND

<u>STATE/COUNTRY</u> <u>INSTALLATION</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>PROJECT</u> <u>AUTH</u>	<u>AUTH</u> <u>FOR</u> <u>APPROP</u>	<u>APPROP</u> <u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
MONTANA					
MALMSTROM AFB					
	BASE ENGINEERING COMPLEX (DBOF)	6,200	6,200	6,200	685
OKLAHOMA					
ALTUS AFB					
	C-17 FIRE STATION (DBOF)	780	780	780	688
	C-17 ADD TO FLIGHT SIMULATOR (DBOF)	2,850	2,850	2,850	689A
	C-17 ADD TO AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE FACILITY (DBOF)	3,300	3,300	3,300	689D
TINKER AFB					
	INDUSTRIAL WASTEWATER REGIONAL CONNECTION (DBOF)	5,400	5,400	5,400	690
SOUTH CAROLINA					
CHARLESTON AFB					
	FIRE TRAINING FACILITY (DBOF)	1,100	1,100	1,100	693
TEXAS					
KELLY AFB					
	C-17 ADD/ALTER NONDESTRUCTIVE INSPECTION FACILITY (DBOF)	4,900	4,900	4,900	696
	C-17 ALTER DEPOT AVIONICS FACILITY (DBOF)	731	731	731	699
	ALTER WEAPON SYSTEMS SUPPORT CENTER, PHASE II (DBOF)	7,800	7,800	7,800	702
	ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES (DBOF)	2,000	2,000	2,000	705
UTAH					
HILL AFB					
	FIRE TRAINING FACILITY (DBOF)	880	880	880	708
	UPGRADE INDUSTRIAL WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT (DBOF)	5,100	5,100	5,100	711

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
INDEX
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 1994
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)
DEFENSE BUSINESS OPERATIONS FUND

<u>STATE/COUNTRY</u> <u>INSTALLATION</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>PROJECT</u> <u>AUTH</u>	<u>AUTH</u> <u>FOR</u> <u>APPROP</u>	<u>APPROP</u> <u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
WASHINGTON MCCHORD AFB					
	ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES (DBOF)	6,500	6,500	6,500	714
	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER COMPLEX (DBOF)	4,400	4,400	4,400	717
	<u>FY 94 TOTAL:</u>	<u>87,921</u>	<u>87,921</u>	<u>87,921</u>	

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
AIR FORCE						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION				4. PROJECT TITLE		
LITTLE ROCK AIR FORCE BASE, ARKANSAS				ADD/ALTER ENGINE INSPECTION AND REPAIR SHOP (DBOF)		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT	6. CATEGORY CODE	7. PROJECT NUMBER	8. PROJECT COST(\$000)			
4.18.96	211-157	NKAK903001	1,200			
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
ADD/ALTER ENGINE INSPECTION AND REPAIR SHOP (DBOF)		SF	9,600		883	
ADDITION		SF	8,000	94	(752)	
ALTERATION		SF	1,600	82	(131)	
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					150	
UTILITIES		LS			(75)	
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(50)	
PAVEMENTS		SY	700	36	(25)	
SUBTOTAL					1,033	
CONTINGENCY (10%)					103	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					1,136	
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (5.5%)					62	
TOTAL REQUEST					1,198	
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					1,200	
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Reinforced concrete foundations and floor, structural steel frames, masonry walls, roof and monorails with hoists. Area includes shop space, maintenance management space, utilities and other necessary support.						
11. REQUIREMENT: 41,564 SF ADEQUATE: 31,964 SF SUBSTANDARD: 1,600 SF PROJECT: Add to and alter aircraft engine inspection and repair shop. (Current Mission)						
REQUIREMENT: An expanded facility is required to maintain, inspect and repair aircraft engines and provide storage for spare engines, tools and support equipment. This facility supports maintenance and inspection operations for 401 C-130 aircraft engines.						
CURRENT SITUATION: The engine repair and build-up crew areas are not large enough to support the number of engines required for effective productivity. Space is necessary for maintenance on four engines while existing facility supports only three engine maintenance spaces. The gas turbine compressor section is overcrowded with special tools, test equipment, as well as with repairable, serviceable and in-work units. The quick engine change (QEC) kit section has been divided into separate sections due to critical space problems, creating span of control problems.						
IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: Maintenance operations will continue to be performed in an overcrowded facility increasing the risk of accidents.						
ADDITIONAL: There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements". Project has been considered for FY97 force structure end strength.						

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																																													
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION LITTLE ROCK AIR FORCE BASE, ARKANSAS																																															
4. PROJECT TITLE ADD/ALTER ENGINE INSPECTION AND REPAIR SHOP (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER NKAK903001																																														
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <table data-bbox="297 588 1410 1176"> <tr> <td colspan="3">(1) Status:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td></td> <td>92 APR 21</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td></td> <td>40%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td></td> <td>92 AUG 28</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td></td> <td>93 MAY 25</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(2) Basis:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td></td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td></td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td></td> <td>72</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td></td> <td>42</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td></td> <td>114</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td></td> <td>114</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(4) Construction Start</td> <td></td> <td>94 MAR</td> </tr> </table> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(1) Status:			(a) Date Design Started		92 APR 21	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		40%	(c) Date 35% Designed		92 AUG 28	(d) Date Design Complete		93 MAY 25	(2) Basis:			(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A	(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)			(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		72	(b) All Other Design Costs		42	(c) Total		114	(d) Contract			(e) In-house		114	(4) Construction Start		94 MAR
(1) Status:																																															
(a) Date Design Started		92 APR 21																																													
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		40%																																													
(c) Date 35% Designed		92 AUG 28																																													
(d) Date Design Complete		93 MAY 25																																													
(2) Basis:																																															
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO																																													
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A																																													
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)																																															
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		72																																													
(b) All Other Design Costs		42																																													
(c) Total		114																																													
(d) Contract																																															
(e) In-house		114																																													
(4) Construction Start		94 MAR																																													

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)		2. DATE	
AIR FORCE					
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION			4. PROJECT TITLE		
LITTLE ROCK AIR FORCE BASE, ARKANSAS			ADD TO AND ALTER CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER (DBOF)		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT	6. CATEGORY CODE	7. PROJECT NUMBER	8. PROJECT COST(\$000)		
4.18.96	740-884	NKAK923003	2,250		
9. COST ESTIMATES					
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
ADD TO AND ALTER CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER (DBOF)		SF	23,200		1,588
ADDITION		SF	8,300	89	(739)
ALTERATION		SF	14,900	57	(849)
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					355
UTILITIES		LS			(200)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(50)
PAVEMENTS		LS			(105)
SUBTOTAL					1,943
CONTINGENCY (10%)					194
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					2,137
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					128
TOTAL REQUEST					2,265
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					2,250
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Concrete footings, foundations, and floor slab, masonry walls, brick veneer and hip roof. Includes space for reception area, administrative offices, classrooms, kitchen, mechanical room, fire protection, utilities and other necessary support. Air Conditioning: 60 Tons.					
11. REQUIREMENT: 25,875 SF ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 14,900 SF <u>PROJECT</u> : Add to and alter child development center. (Current Mission) <u>REQUIREMENT</u> : A facility is required to provide adequate space and environment for child development requirements and an atmosphere conducive to the needs of 345 dependent children of military and civilian personnel assigned to the base. <u>CURRENT SITUATION</u> : The existing facility provides only two thirds of the space needed to adequately support child care needs. Inefficiencies include lack of classroom space, administration, food service area and recreational support area. Changes in the makeup of the military and civilian population have increased the need for full-day child care development services. Single parents, dual working couples, and working spouses have changed the focus from a recreational support activity to a mission support program. Because more children stay at the center ten hours a day, five days a week, improved developmental care facilities must provide more adequate indoor and outdoor play space, learning centers, sleeping facilities and kitchen/food service areas. Off-base child care centers are available; however, they are substandard in that they are not certified by the State of Arkansas and do not meet minimum Air Force and Department of Defense standards for child care. These facilities provide little more than custodial care. They experience an extremely high turn-over rate in workers because they pay minimum wages. Workers are not					

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION LITTLE ROCK AIR FORCE BASE, ARKANSAS		
4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO AND ALTER CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER NKAK923003	
<p>screened for health problems and criminal records. Most facilities do not provide care for children under two years old. The Little Rock Child Development Center is the only facility in the State of Arkansas accredited by the National Association for the Education of Young Children. Some home care is available on base but not nearly enough to meet base child care demands. The waiting list for full-time day care is for 83 children; however, many families do not bother to sign-up because the list is too long.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Lack of quality child care contributes to employee absenteeism, low morale and has a negative impact in the military and civilian workforces. Expanded program requirements and increased demand for child care cannot be provided due to lack of space.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> This project meets the criteria/scope specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". A life-cycle economic analysis has been performed comparing all reasonable options for accomplishing this project (status quo, addition/alteration and new construction). This analysis indicates the addition/alteration alternative is the most cost effective. Project has been considered for FY97 force structure end strength.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION LITTLE ROCK AIR FORCE BASE, ARKANSAS																								
4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO AND ALTER CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER NKAK923003																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 JUL 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 JUL 27</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 JUL 14</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>135</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>90</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>225</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>183</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>42</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start</p> <p>94 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 JUL 01	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	50%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 JUL 27	(d) Date Design Complete	93 JUL 14	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	135	(b) All Other Design Costs	90	(c) Total	225	(d) Contract	183	(e) In-house	42
(a) Date Design Started	92 JUL 01																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	50%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 JUL 27																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 JUL 14																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	135																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	90																							
(c) Total	225																							
(d) Contract	183																							
(e) In-house	42																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)		2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION MCCLELLAN AIR FORCE BASE, CALIFORNIA			4. PROJECT TITLE FIRE PROTECTION AIRCRAFT FACILITIES (DBOF)	
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 7.28.96	6. CATEGORY CODE 880-232	7. PROJECT NUMBER PRJY881011	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 1,900	

9. COST ESTIMATES				
ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
FIRE PROTECTION AIRCRAFT FACILITIES (DBOF)	SF	196,000	7	1,372
SUPPORTING FACILITIES				240
UTILITIES	LS			(200)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS	LS			(40)
SUBTOTAL				1,612
CONTINGENCY (10%)				161
TOTAL CONTRACT COST				1,773
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)				106
TOTAL REQUEST				1,879
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)				1,900

10. Description of Proposed Construction: Install aqueous film forming foam (AFFF) preaction sprinkler systems and wet pipe sprinkler systems in fifteen buildings, including piping, sprinkler heads, nozzles, and necessary support.

11. REQUIREMENT: As required.
PROJECT: Install fire protection systems in fifteen buildings. (Current Mission)
REQUIREMENT: Automatic AFFF preaction systems are required to support critical base facilities and their contents, including multi-million dollar aircraft and equipment. These systems are needed to minimize hazard to life and property by quickly suppressing a fuel fire before injury or widespread damage can occur. This level of fire protection is consistent with standards developed by the National Fire Protection Association.
CURRENT SITUATION: There are no fire protection systems in fifteen docks used to accomplish depot maintenance of first line aircraft. A fire in any of these facilities could endanger the building, its contents and occupants. All of these buildings are needed to accomplish depot maintenance workloads assigned to the Sacramento Air Logistics Center.
IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: Loss of life, first line aircraft and equipment will remain a possibility. The total value of aircraft at risk could be as high as \$650 million.
ADDITIONAL: There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements".

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION MCCLELLAN AIR FORCE BASE, CALIFORNIA																								
4. PROJECT TITLE FIRE PROTECTION AIRCRAFT FACILITIES (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER PRJY881011																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="360 636 1407 762"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 AUG 19</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 OCT 24</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 NOV 22</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="360 831 1407 888"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="360 957 1407 1108"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>100</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>122</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>222</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>139</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>83</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 JAN</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 AUG 19	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 OCT 24	(d) Date Design Complete	93 NOV 22	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	100	(b) All Other Design Costs	122	(c) Total	222	(d) Contract	139	(e) In-house	83
(a) Date Design Started	92 AUG 19																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 OCT 24																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 NOV 22																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	100																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	122																							
(c) Total	222																							
(d) Contract	139																							
(e) In-house	83																							

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)		2. DATE	
AIR FORCE					
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION			4. PROJECT TITLE		
TRAVIS AIR FORCE BASE, CALIFORNIA			UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS (DBOF)		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT	6. CATEGORY CODE	7. PROJECT NUMBER	8. PROJECT COST(\$000)		
4.18.56	411-135	XDAT943075	2,840		
9. COST ESTIMATES					
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS (DBOF)		LS			2,400
UPGRADE UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANKS		EA	7	40,000	(280)
CONSTRUCT UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANKS		EA	10	107,000	(1,070)
CONSTRUCT ABOVEGROUND STORAGE TANKS		EA	14	75,000	(1,050)
SUBTOTAL					2,400
CONTINGENCY (10%)					240
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					2,640
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					158
TOTAL REQUEST					2,798
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					2,840
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Upgrade 7 tanks and their pressurized lines with leak detection. Replace 10 existing tanks with new double-walled underground tanks, leak detectors and other necessary support. In addition, replace another 14 underground tanks with aboveground tanks.					
11. REQUIREMENT: As required. <u>PROJECT:</u> Upgrade underground fuel storage tanks. (Current Mission) <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> This is a Level I environmental compliance project to upgrade underground storage tanks (USTs) regulated by the California State Water Resources Control Board (CSWRCB). This board has set standards that require all regulated USTs to have leak detection, corrosion protection, and spill/overflow prevention systems. If USTs are to be replaced, Air Force policy is to replace them with aboveground tanks or to relocate them into underground vaults wherever possible. <u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> The majority of the USTs at Travis have exceeded their design lives and are in need of replacement. Approximately 97% of the regulated USTs are also out of compliance with current (1988) state regulations. All of the regulated USTs require annual integrity (tightness) testing, daily fluid level monitoring and monthly inventory reconciliation and control, since they lack the proper continuous monitoring appliances and controls. If these tasks are not performed, the exposure to environmental liability will increase. These liabilities can be eliminated through the installation of the new USTs or aboveground storage tanks (ASTs) and associated continuous monitoring/alarm systems. <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Failure to bring the USTs into environmental compliance will result in Travis AFB receiving a Notice of Violation (NOV) from the regulators. This will ultimately result in fines or litigation					

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION TRAVIS AIR FORCE BASE, CALIFORNIA		
4. PROJECT TITLE UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER XDAT943075	
<p>and unfavorable publicity for the Air Force. All tanks must meet regulations or be permanently closed. The absence of sufficient fuel storage due to mandatory tank closure would seriously jeopardize the base's mission.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements". A preliminary analysis of reasonable options for accomplishing this project (status quo, renovation, and new construction) was done. It indicates there is only one option that satisfies regulatory requirements. Because of this, a full economic analysis was not performed. A certificate of exception has been prepared. Project has been considered for FY97 force structure end strength.</p>		

1. COMPONENT	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
AIR FORCE		
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION		
TRAVIS AIR FORCE BASE, CALIFORNIA		
4. PROJECT TITLE		5. PROJECT NUMBER
UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE TANKS (DBOF)		XDAT943075
12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:		
a. Estimated Design Data:		
(1) Status:		
(a) Date Design Started		92 JUN 01
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		35%
(c) Date 35% Designed		93 JAN 31
(d) Date Design Complete		94 JAN 05
(2) Basis:		
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)		
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		65
(b) All Other Design Costs		
(c) Total		65
(d) Contract		65
(e) In-house		
(4) Construction Start		94 MAY
b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A		

665c

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION DOVER AIR FORCE BASE, DELAWARE		4. PROJECT TITLE DORMITORY (DBOF)		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 4.18.96	6. CATEGORY CODE 721-312	7. PROJECT NUMBER FJXT943005	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 3,200	

9. COST ESTIMATES				
ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
DORMITORY (DBOF)	SF	25,000	90	2,250
SUPPORTING FACILITIES				630
UTILITIES	LS			(165)
PAVEMENTS	LS			(165)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS	LS			(115)
DEMOLITION	SF	30,900	6	(185)
SUBTOTAL				2,880
CONTINGENCY (5%)				144
TOTAL CONTRACT COST				3,024
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)				181
TOTAL REQUEST				3,205
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)				3,200

10. Description of Proposed Construction: Reinforced concrete foundation and floor slabs, masonry walls and roof. Includes room-bath-room modules, laundries, storage and lounge areas and all supporting facilities.
Air Conditioning: 100 Tons. Grade Mix: 175 El-E4.

11. REQUIREMENT: 1,787 PN ADEQUATE: 901 PN SUBSTANDARD: 1,624 PN
PROJECT: Construct a dormitory. (Current Mission)
REQUIREMENT: A major Air Force objective is to provide unaccompanied enlisted personnel with housing conducive to their proper rest, relaxation and personal well-being. Properly designed and furnished quarters providing some degree of individual privacy are essential to the successful accomplishment of the increasingly complicated and important jobs these people must perform.
CURRENT SITUATION: There are currently not enough adequate dormitories to meet the billeting requirements of unaccompanied enlisted personnel at this base. Substandard facilities to be replaced are semi-permanent, modular facilities which do not provide semi-private baths, adequate control of heating and air conditioning, sufficient noise attenuation or necessary amenities to adequately house enlisted personnel. This project is the fourth phase of a six phase program to provide adequate dormitories at this base. Current occupancy rate of dorms at Dover is 98 percent. Three substandard facilities which house 106 personnel will be disposed of upon completion of this project.
IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: Adequate living quarters will continue to be unavailable resulting in degradation of morale, productivity, and career satisfaction for unaccompanied enlisted personnel.
ADDITIONAL: This project meets the criteria/scope specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". A

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION DOVER AIR FORCE BASE, DELAWARE		
4. PROJECT TITLE DORMITORY (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER FJXT943005	
<p>life-cycle economic analysis has been performed comparing all reasonable options for accomplishing this project (status quo, renovation, and new construction). This analysis indicates the new construction alternative is the most economical. Project has been considered for FY97 force structure end strength.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION DOVER AIR FORCE BASE, DELAWARE																								
4. PROJECT TITLE DORMITORY (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER FJXT943005																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="355 640 1419 766"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 AUG 12</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>93 JAN 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 AUG 23</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="355 829 1419 892"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="355 955 1419 1123"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>192</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>208</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>400</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>78</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>322</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 AUG 12	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	93 JAN 15	(d) Date Design Complete	93 AUG 23	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	192	(b) All Other Design Costs	208	(c) Total	400	(d) Contract	78	(e) In-house	322
(a) Date Design Started	92 AUG 12																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	93 JAN 15																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 AUG 23																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	192																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	208																							
(c) Total	400																							
(d) Contract	78																							
(e) In-house	322																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)		2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION DOVER AIR FORCE BASE, DELAWARE			4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO AND ALTER DINING FACILITY (DBOF)		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 4.18.96	6. CATEGORY CODE 722-351	7. PROJECT NUMBER FJXT933000	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 2,500		
9. COST ESTIMATES					
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
ADD TO AND ALTER DINING FACILITY (DBOF)		SF	15,950		1,738
ADDITION		SF	1,150	160	(184)
ALTERATION		SF	14,800	105	(1,554)
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					420
UTILITIES		LS			(200)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(75)
PAVEMENTS		LS			(110)
ASBESTOS REMOVAL		LS			(33)
SUBTOTAL					2,158
CONTINGENCY (10%)					216
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					2,374
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					142
TOTAL REQUEST					2,516
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					2,500
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Reinforced concrete foundation and floor slab and roof panels. All electrical, mechanical, and structural work necessary to reconfigure existing kitchen, serving area and dining area. Air Conditioning: 30 Tons.					
11. REQUIREMENT: 17,800 SF ADEQUATE: 1,850 SF SUBSTANDARD: 14,800 SF <u>PROJECT</u> : Add to and alter dining facility. (Current Mission) <u>REQUIREMENT</u> : Adequate space is required for food preparation, serving line, dishwashing equipment, dining area, and storage of perishable and non-perishable food. <u>CURRENT SITUATION</u> : The dining hall activities are presently being conducted in a facility that is too small and not properly configured to support assigned and transient personnel. Inefficiencies include 17-year-old outdated serving line equipment, lack of adequate sanitation, and inadequately sized or configured dining and kitchen area which does not permit optimal use of existing space. The existing dining facility was constructed in 1975. Subsequent to this construction, sanitation standards have changed in kitchen washing and cleaning operations which cannot be met due to the design and equipment layout. Insufficient storage space for pots and pans has caused medical write-ups for sanitation discrepancies. Additional space is required for patron seating. Lack of adequate seating space and food serving line causes unnecessary delays for personnel who are on meal breaks from their jobs. <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED</u> : Dining hall operations will continue to be performed in a substandard and overcrowded facility. Morale of our personnel will continue to be adversely impacted if they are forced to take meals in such an inadequate and unattractive facility.					

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION DOVER AIR FORCE BASE, DELAWARE		
4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO AND ALTER DINING FACILITY (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER FJXT933000	
<p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> This project meets the criteria/scope specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". A life-cycle economic analysis has been performed comparing all reasonable options for accomplishing this project (status quo, addition/alteration and new construction). This analysis indicates the addition/alteration alternative is the most economical. Project has been considered for FY97 force structure end strength.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION DOVER AIR FORCE BASE, DELAWARE																								
4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO AND ALTER DINING FACILITY (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER FJXT933000																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="349 636 1404 766"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>93 JAN 29</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>93 APR 26</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 NOV 12</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="349 829 1404 892"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="349 955 1404 1113"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>150</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>100</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>250</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>170</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>80</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 AUG</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	93 JAN 29	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	2%	(c) Date 35% Designed	93 APR 26	(d) Date Design Complete	93 NOV 12	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	150	(b) All Other Design Costs	100	(c) Total	250	(d) Contract	170	(e) In-house	80
(a) Date Design Started	93 JAN 29																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	2%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	93 APR 26																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 NOV 12																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	150																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	100																							
(c) Total	250																							
(d) Contract	170																							
(e) In-house	80																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE			
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ROBINS AIR FORCE BASE, GEORGIA				4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES (DBOF)				
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 7.28.96		6. CATEGORY CODE 721-312	7. PROJECT NUMBER UHHZ933001		8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 4,300			
9. COST ESTIMATES								
ITEM					U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES (DBOF)					SF	57,200		3,176
ADDITION					SF	6,700	67	(449)
ALTERATION					SF	50,500	54	(2,727)
SUPPORTING FACILITIES								530
UTILITIES					LS			(290)
PAVEMENTS					LS			(85)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS					LS			(110)
COMMUNICATIONS SUPPORT					LS			(45)
SUBTOTAL								3,706
CONTINGENCY (10%)								371
TOTAL CONTRACT COST								4,077
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)								245
TOTAL REQUEST								4,322
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)								4,300
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Alter interior partitioning to provide room-bath-room modules, exterior entrances and balconies; extend roofline and upgrade exterior; install cable TV system; upgrade laundry rooms, HVAC and utility systems, provide insulation and necessary support.								
11. REQUIREMENT: 1,526 PN ADEQUATE: 960 PN SUBSTANDARD: 272 PN PROJECT: Add to and alter two dormitories. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: A major Air Force objective is to provide unaccompanied enlisted personnel with housing conducive to their proper rest, relaxation and personal well-being. Properly designed and furnished quarters providing some degree of individual privacy are essential to the successful accomplishment of the increasingly complicated and important jobs which these people must perform. CURRENT SITUATION: The buildings were constructed in 1960 when standards of construction for bachelor quarters were considerably lower. Common latrines, inadequate lighting, poor insulation and sound attenuation, obsolete electrical and mechanical systems, and lack of privacy are major deficiencies of these facilities. This is the third phase of a three phase effort to provide adequate quarters for enlisted personnel at this base. IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: Substandard living conditions will continue to degrade the morale, productivity and career satisfaction of enlisted personnel assigned to this base. ADDITIONAL: This project meets the criteria/scope specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". While it is recognized that the initial cost of renovating these facilities exceeds 70 percent of the replacement cost, a life-cycle economic analysis has been performed comparing all reasonable options for accomplishing this project								

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ROBINS AIR FORCE BASE, GEORGIA		
4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER UHHZ933001	
<p>(status quo, renovation, new construction, and leasing). This analysis indicates the renovation alternative is the most economical over the life of the facility.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ROBINS AIR FORCE BASE, GEORGIA																								
4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER UHHZ933001																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="360 636 1410 762"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 AUG 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 OCT 25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 SEP 30</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="360 827 1377 888"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>YES</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>ROBINS</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="360 953 1410 1108"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>155</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>110</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>265</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>178</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>87</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 MAR</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 AUG 15	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 OCT 25	(d) Date Design Complete	93 SEP 30	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	YES	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	ROBINS	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	155	(b) All Other Design Costs	110	(c) Total	265	(d) Contract	178	(e) In-house	87
(a) Date Design Started	92 AUG 15																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 OCT 25																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 SEP 30																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	YES																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	ROBINS																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	155																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	110																							
(c) Total	265																							
(d) Contract	178																							
(e) In-house	87																							

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)		2. DATE	
AIR FORCE					
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION			4. PROJECT TITLE		
SCOTT AIR FORCE BASE, ILLINOIS			MUNITIONS STORAGE FACILITY/ LAND ACQUISITION (DBOF)		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT	6. CATEGORY CODE	7. PROJECT NUMBER	8. PROJECT COST(\$000)		
4.18.96	422-253	VDYD923004	2,450		
9. COST ESTIMATES					
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
MUNITIONS STORAGE FACILITY/ LAND ACQUISITION (DBOF)		LS			1,538
MULTICUBICLE MAGAZINE STORAGE		SF	4,850	150	(728)
MUNITIONS HOLDING AREA		SF	400	150	(60)
MUNITIONS MAINT ADMINISTRATION		SF	1,000	100	(100)
LAND, FEE PURCHASE		AC	22	19,090	(420)
LAND, EASEMENT		AC	230	1,000	(230)
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					480
UTILITIES		LS			(380)
PAVEMENTS		LS			(100)
SUBTOTAL					2,018
CONTINGENCY (5%)					101
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					2,119
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					127
TOTAL REQUEST					2,246
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					2,450
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Reinforced concrete foundation and floor slab. Area includes 14 munitions storage bays, fire sprinkler system and a munitions inspection and maintenance facility. Also included are roads, parking fencing, security lighting and alarms and necessary support. Land purchase includes 22 acres and easements include 230 acres.					
11. REQUIREMENT: 6,250 SF ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 410 SF PROJECT: Construct a munitions storage facility and land acquisition. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: Adequate munitions storage and inspection area is required to support training, operational and mobility requirements. Storage magazines must be sized to accommodate the 463L aircraft pallet to meet mobility requirements. Space must be provided to support the security police air base ground defense unit, the explosives ordnance disposal team, HQ AMC combat controllers and mobility missions and training needs of various base organizations. Location should conform to quantity distance criteria for minimum blast and fragmentation distances from inhabited buildings and public roadways. Land purchase consisting of 22 acres is required for construction of munitions storage, munitions maintenance space, and parking area. Easements consisting of 230 acres is required to provide the required buffer zone specified in quantity distance criteria for munitions storage facilities. CURRENT SITUATION: The existing munitions storage/training facility is too small, providing less than ten percent of space required to support base requirements. Lack of space requires munitions to be stored at Little Rock AFB and an Army Depot 50 miles away. During recent DESERT STORM Operations, the 375 CSG Air Base Ground Defense Unit had to deploy without their munitions because munitions were stored at Little Rock. The					

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION SCOTT AIR FORCE BASE, ILLINOIS		
4. PROJECT TITLE MUNITIONS STORAGE FACILITY/ LAND ACQUISITION (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER VDYD923004	
<p>existing location does not meet quantity distance criteria for minimum blast and fragmentation distances to inhabited buildings (1,250 feet; nearest building is 250 feet) and public traffic routes (750 feet; nearest road is 100 feet). There is no available space on base on which to construct this facility. Therefore, land must be purchased as part of this project.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Mission requirements for training, mobility and operations will be severely impacted by depending on other installations, distant from the base, for munitions storage.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements". Project has been considered for FY97 force structure end strength.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																																													
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION SCOTT AIR FORCE BASE, ILLINOIS																																															
4. PROJECT TITLE MUNITIONS STORAGE FACILITY/ LAND ACQUISITION (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER VDYD923004																																														
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td colspan="3">(1) Status:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td></td> <td>92 SEP 30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td></td> <td>15%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td></td> <td>93 AUG 16</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td></td> <td>93 DEC 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(2) Basis:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td></td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td></td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td></td> <td>123</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td></td> <td>123</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> <td>123</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(4) Construction Start</td> <td></td> <td>94 JAN</td> </tr> </table> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(1) Status:			(a) Date Design Started		92 SEP 30	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		15%	(c) Date 35% Designed		93 AUG 16	(d) Date Design Complete		93 DEC 15	(2) Basis:			(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A	(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)			(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		123	(b) All Other Design Costs			(c) Total		123	(d) Contract		123	(e) In-house			(4) Construction Start		94 JAN
(1) Status:																																															
(a) Date Design Started		92 SEP 30																																													
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93		15%																																													
(c) Date 35% Designed		93 AUG 16																																													
(d) Date Design Complete		93 DEC 15																																													
(2) Basis:																																															
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -		NO																																													
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -		N/A																																													
(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)																																															
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications		123																																													
(b) All Other Design Costs																																															
(c) Total		123																																													
(d) Contract		123																																													
(e) In-house																																															
(4) Construction Start		94 JAN																																													

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)		2. DATE	
AIR FORCE					
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION			4. PROJECT TITLE		
ANDREWS AIR FORCE BASE, MARYLAND			AIR FREIGHT TERMINAL (DBOF)		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT	6. CATEGORY CODE	7. PROJECT NUMBER	8. PROJECT COST(\$000)		
4.18.96	141-782	AJXF923002	4,400		
9. COST ESTIMATES					
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
AIR FREIGHT TERMINAL (DBOF)		LS			3,286
AIR FREIGHT TERMINAL		SF	33,800	83	(2,805)
ADMINISTRATIVE SPACE		SF	4,800	92	(442)
AIR FREIGHT PAVED STORAGE		SY	1,700	23	(39)
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					675
UTILITIES		LS			(290)
PAVEMENTS		LS			(290)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(55)
SUBTOTAL					3,961
CONTINGENCY (5%)					198
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					4,159
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					250
TOTAL REQUEST					4,409
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					4,400
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Reinforced concrete footings, foundation and floor slab, structural steel frame, insulated walls and roof, fire protection system, and utilities. Area includes space for covered pallet-train buildup, packing and crating, administration and necessary support.					
11. REQUIREMENT: 38,600 SF ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 18,700 SF PROJECT: Construct an air freight terminal. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: Adequate facilities for conveyorable and non-conveyorable cargo, pallet buildup and netting, aircraft pallet storage, special cargo processing and storage, packing and crating and freight management. Facility will be configured to accommodate modern mechanized handling equipment. CURRENT SITUATION: Air freight operations are currently accomplished in an aircraft maintenance hangar which provides only 50 percent of the required space. Inefficiencies include lack of off-load docks, packing and crating area, outdated, inefficient material handling equipment and inadequate security for sensitive cargo. Cargo is processed to support State Department, embassy flights, foreign governments and special high visibility flights. Much of this cargo requires a secure storage area which can only be achieved by posting security police to guard the cargo until it can be processed for shipping. Aircraft pallet storage located outside offers no protection from the elements. When vacated, the space (18,700 SF) will be converted back to hangar space and thereby reduce the 64,000 SF hangar space deficiency at Andrews. Remaining hangar space deficiency will be satisfied in future MILCON program. IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: Air freight operations will continue to be performed in a substandard facility which results in reduced productivity					

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ANDREWS AIR FORCE BASE, MARYLAND		
4. PROJECT TITLE AIR FREIGHT TERMINAL (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER AJXF923C72	
<p>and low worker morale.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements". A life-cycle economic analysis has been performed comparing all reasonable options for accomplishing this project (status quo, contracting out services, renovation and new construction). This analysis indicates the new construction alternative is the most economical. Project has been considered for FY97 force structure end strength.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ANDREWS AIR FORCE BASE, MARYLAND																								
4. PROJECT TITLE AIR FREIGHT TERMINAL (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER AJXF923002																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="365 636 1419 768"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 SEP 17</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 OCT 29</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 SEP 27</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="365 831 1419 894"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="365 957 1419 1115"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>225</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>138</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>363</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>326</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>37</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 SEP 17	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 OCT 29	(d) Date Design Complete	93 SEP 27	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	225	(b) All Other Design Costs	138	(c) Total	363	(d) Contract	326	(e) In-house	37
(a) Date Design Started	92 SEP 17																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 OCT 29																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 SEP 27																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	225																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	138																							
(c) Total	363																							
(d) Contract	326																							
(e) In-house	37																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ANDREWS AIR FORCE BASE, MARYLAND			4. PROJECT TITLE FIRE TRAINING FACILITY (DBOF)			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 4.18.56	6. CATEGORY CODE 179-511	7. PROJECT NUMBER AJXF953020	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 1,000			
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
FIRE TRAINING FACILITY (DBOF)		EA	1	740,000	740	
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					155	
UTILITIES		LS			(60)	
PAVEMENTS		SY	35	1,429	(50)	
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(45)	
SUBTOTAL					895	
CONTINGENCY (5%)					45	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					940	
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					56	
TOTAL REQUEST					996	
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					1,000	
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Live fire training facility with large frame aircraft mock-up, polyethylene liner system, JP-4 fuel pump and piping system, commercial power hook-up, gravity oil/water separator, access road, effluent holding pond and all necessary support.						
11. REQUIREMENT: 1 LS ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 1 LS <u>PROJECT:</u> Construct fire training facility. (Current Mission) <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> This is a Level II environmental compliance project. A live fire training facility is required to meet all environmental and safety regulations. Live fire training exercises, an FAA quarterly requirement, enable fire fighters to maintain a high level of proficiency by extinguishing two types of live fires: mass fuel spills and three dimensional (running fuel) fires. These exercises, performed on mock-ups typical of the mission assigned aircraft, have created compliance problems with the Clean Water Act. An impermeable lining below the pit area is required to prevent waste oils and fuels from leaching into the ground and contaminating the groundwater. <u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> The existing live fire training facility violated EPA pollution standards and was closed 30 April 1990. It is inadequate for training as defined by Air Force regulation. The current aircraft mock-up is smaller than the required size and is not accessible for multi-directional approaches creating an artificial environment which limits the quality of training. The existing facility does not have high-density polyethylene flexible membrane liners and nets, a leak detection system, and spill containment capability. There are no environmentally approved live fire training facilities in the local area. <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> The existing facility is closed because of previous violations of environmental requirements. Required live fire						

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ANDREWS AIR FORCE BASE, MARYLAND		
4. PROJECT TITLE FIRE TRAINING FACILITY (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER AJXF953020	
<p>training for the assigned fire fighters is not available. Without the stress and realism that come only with live fires, the fire fighters lose proficiency in combating fires. The potential for loss of aircraft and life is increased.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There are no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". This project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements". Project has been considered for FY97 force structure end strength.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ANDREWS AIR FORCE BASE, MARYLAND																								
4. PROJECT TITLE FIRE TRAINING FACILITY (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER AJXF953020																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="360 632 1410 762"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 OCT 10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>65%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 OCT 31</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 OCT 10</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="360 825 1361 888"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>YES</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>SCOTT</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="360 951 1410 1108"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>60</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>80</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>60</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>20</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 OCT 10	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	65%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 OCT 31	(d) Date Design Complete	93 OCT 10	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	YES	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	SCOTT	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	60	(b) All Other Design Costs	20	(c) Total	80	(d) Contract	60	(e) In-house	20
(a) Date Design Started	92 OCT 10																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	65%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 OCT 31																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 OCT 10																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	YES																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	SCOTT																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	60																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	20																							
(c) Total	80																							
(d) Contract	60																							
(e) In-house	20																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ANDREWS AIR FORCE BASE, MARYLAND			4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE COMPOSITE ADMINISTRATION FACILITY (DBOF)			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 9.12.12S	6. CATEGORY CODE 610-000	7. PROJECT NUMBER AJXF943010	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 9,940			
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
UPGRADE COMPOSITE ADMINISTRATION FACILITY (DBOF)		SF	347,500	7	2,433	
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					6,050	
HVAC		LS			(3,600)	
DEMOLITION		SF	215,000	5	(1,075)	
COMMUNICATIONS		LS			(875)	
SYSTEMS FURNITURE		LS			(500)	
SUBTOTAL					8,483	
CONTINGENCY (10%)					848	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					9,331	
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6.5%)					607	
TOTAL REQUEST					9,938	
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					9,940	
EQUIPMENT FROM OTHER APPROPRIATIONS (NON-ADD)					(650)	
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Structural, mechanical and electrical upgrade required to accommodate new occupants.						
11. REQUIREMENT: 672,931 SF ADEQUATE: 341,944 SF SUBSTANDARD: 190,087 SF <u>PROJECT</u> : Upgrade composite administration building and inadequate utility systems for new occupancy following relocation/integration of Air Force Systems Command into new command. (Current Mission) <u>REQUIREMENT</u> : Improve existing facility to support complete change in occupancy. New occupants will move into the facility from substandard facilities on Andrews and from other installations. Demolition of 10 substandard facilities totalling 65 KSF and a Bolling AFB 119.8 KSF facility is included in this project. An additional 7 facilities totalling 31 KSF will be temporarily reused to relieve a space shortage in the Air National Guard Bureau (ANGB) HQ and demolished during FY95 MILCON construction of a new ANGB facility. Total space reductions achieved through this project are demolition of 215 KSF of substandard facilities. This project supports facility consolidation and reduction initiatives. This facility will provide a centralized customer service center for base civilian and military personnel, finance, pass and identification, legal, claim services, transportation management office and scheduled airlines ticket office. It will also become the new headquarters for HQ/AFOSI. <u>CURRENT SITUATION</u> : Combining Air Force Systems Command and Air Force Logistics Command into Air Force Materiel Command at Wright-Patterson AFB leaves bldg 1535 at Andrews AFB available for complete change of occupancy. Administrative occupants from Andrews and from the National Capital Region (NCR) will move into existing offices. HQ/AFOSI's current facility suffers from severe termite damage precluding the addition of						

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ANDREWS AIR FORCE BASE, MARYLAND		
4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE COMPOSITE ADMINISTRATION FACILITY (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER AJXF943010	
<p>safes and the updating of computer systems, in addition to causing a safety hazard. To date, the 89 AW and 89 SPTG staff have moved in with portions of finance, manpower, 89 AW Judge Advocate, 89 AW Community Support, CBPO, Civilian Personnel and Traffic Management. The functions which can move without construction have moved. The major components of the heating system are original from 1946 construction of the building, and the air conditioning system is 1964 construction. The main chillers and air handling units are no longer available, and the system is overtaxed because the loads in the building have gradually increased over the years. Air handling units are undersized for the building configuration and loads and wall mounted fan coil units are ineffective for open office areas. Current substandard facilities require inordinate amounts of utilities, maintenance and repair. Parts are not available to repair obsolete systems, requiring extra effort in manufacturing or altering substitutes.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> If upgrades are not accomplished building tenants will be forced to occupy substandard spaces. HQ AFOSI will not be able to meet expanding mission requirements levied by DOD, HQ USAF, and the NCA because of the structural limitations of their current facility. In addition, the condition of facility systems, including HVAC, lighting, electrical, and security will continue to degrade, increasing the drain on scarce O&M resources. System outages impact the ability of occupants to perform their missions.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> This project will result in the vacating of facilities on the following government properties: Washington Navy Yard (1,100 SF), Bolling AFB (98,500 SF) and Fort Belvoir (19,652 SF). Initial beddown requirements (excluding HQ AFOSI) were met under O&M renovation project AJXF921586, Renovate Base Headquarters. The primary justification for this project is consolidation and reduction of space. An economic analysis has been performed which supports this project as the most economical alternative to provide adequate facilities.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																														
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ANDREWS AIR FORCE BASE, MARYLAND																																
4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE COMPOSITE ADMINISTRATION FACILITY (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER AJXF943010																															
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>93 APR 20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>93 OCT 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>94 MAR 10</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>483</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>322</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>805</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>478</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>327</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 MAY</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations:</p> <table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th>EQUIPMENT NOMENCLATURE</th> <th>PROCURING APPROPRIATION</th> <th>FISCAL YEAR APPROPRIATED OR REQUESTED</th> <th>COST (\$000)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>OFFICE EQUIPMENT</td> <td>3080</td> <td>93</td> <td>650</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			(a) Date Design Started	93 APR 20	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	2%	(c) Date 35% Designed	93 OCT 01	(d) Date Design Complete	94 MAR 10	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	483	(b) All Other Design Costs	322	(c) Total	805	(d) Contract	478	(e) In-house	327	EQUIPMENT NOMENCLATURE	PROCURING APPROPRIATION	FISCAL YEAR APPROPRIATED OR REQUESTED	COST (\$000)	OFFICE EQUIPMENT	3080	93	650
(a) Date Design Started	93 APR 20																															
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	2%																															
(c) Date 35% Designed	93 OCT 01																															
(d) Date Design Complete	94 MAR 10																															
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																															
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																															
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	483																															
(b) All Other Design Costs	322																															
(c) Total	805																															
(d) Contract	478																															
(e) In-house	327																															
EQUIPMENT NOMENCLATURE	PROCURING APPROPRIATION	FISCAL YEAR APPROPRIATED OR REQUESTED	COST (\$000)																													
OFFICE EQUIPMENT	3080	93	650																													

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION MALMSTROM AIR FORCE BASE, MONTANA		4. PROJECT TITLE BASE ENGINEERING COMPLEX (DBOF)		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 1.18.96M	6. CATEGORY CODE 219-944	7. PROJECT NUMBER NZAS943250	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 6,200	
9. COST ESTIMATES				
ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
BASE ENGINEERING COMPLEX (DBOF)	SF	47,900		4,753
BASE PAVEMENTS & GROUND FACILITY	SF	17,500	150	(2,625)
BASE ENGINEER COVERED STORAGE	SF	30,400	70	(2,128)
SUPPORTING FACILITIES				840
UTILITIES/COMM SUPPORT	LS			(740)
PAVEMENTS	SY	2,800	36	(100)
SUBTOTAL				5,593
CONTINGENCY (5%)				280
TOTAL CONTRACT COST				5,873
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)				352
TOTAL REQUEST				6,225
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)				6,200
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Reinforced concrete foundation footings and floor slabs, concrete masonry unit or reinforced precast concrete walls, sloped roof on steel deck, electrically operated vehicle doors, utility services, oil/water separator, storm drainage, parking and storage area pavement upgrade, curbs, gutters, security fencing, CID, fire protection, area lighting and necessary support. Air Conditioning: 10 Tons.				
11. REQUIREMENT: 163,415 SF ADEQUATE: 107,353 SF SUBSTANDARD: 47,332 SF <u>PROJECT</u> : Construct a base engineering complex. (Current Mission) <u>REQUIREMENT</u> : Adequate and properly configured facilities are required to house base and missile site workforce management and control and in-house engineering and contract management staffs. Covered storage is required to protect construction materials and snow removal equipment/materials from pilferage and exposure to the deteriorating influences of the weather. Properly configured pavements and grounds and maintenance shop space must be provided for effective execution of facility and utility maintenance and repair responsibilities throughout the base, and off-base missile launch and control facilities. These functions must have an environment conducive to the effective maintenance and support of all facilities, and design/construction of facility projects. Overall space requirements have been adjusted downward in view of reduced future manning for the BCE organization. <u>CURRENT SITUATION</u> : Adequate and safe facilities are not available. The pavements and equipment shop, exterior electric, equipment and material staging areas, and the management offices to support missile engineering, readiness management and training are currently accommodated in a				

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION MALMSTROM AIR FORCE BASE, MONTANA		
4. PROJECT TITLE BASE ENGINEERING COMPLEX (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER NZAS943250	
<p>deteriorated World War II wood frame hangar. The facility has been assigned an OSHA Risk Assessment Code (RAC) II, and a Fire Protection Deficiency Code of II, both identifying a serious deficiency which could result in loss of life or resources valued at over \$1M. Because of its location on the flightline, the facility also creates a hazard for aircraft operations due to mud and debris falling from maintenance vehicles and creating a foreign object damage potential for aircraft. The wood roof and wall trusses are cracked and rotten and the built-up roof leaks onto equipment and materials stored in the facility. The hangar has large sections where the cement asbestos siding is missing and has been replaced with painted plywood. The hangar has no wall or roof insulation and no fire suppression or detection systems. Most of the electrical distribution and lighting systems are 1943 vintage and are totally inadequate. The electrical distribution system is overloaded and is a fire hazard. A portion of the base engineer materials and equipment staging areas are located separately from the maintenance complex. This project will consolidate these functions.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Base Civil Engineering management and support functions will continue operating from unsafe, undersized, separated and inadequate facilities which negatively impact mission capability and the morale of assigned personnel. The potential for catastrophic fire or industrial accident with serious injuries or significant loss of life and resources will remain unacceptably high.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements". An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of new construction, revitalization, leasing and status quo operation. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, new construction was found to be the most cost efficient over the life of the project. Project has been considered for FY97 force structure end strength.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION MALMSTROM AIR FORCE BASE, MONTANA																								
4. PROJECT TITLE BASE ENGINEERING COMPLEX (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER NZAS943250																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>88 DEC 22</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>90 SEP 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 JUN 01</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) + (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>372</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>180</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>552</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>439</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>113</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	88 DEC 22	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	90 SEP 15	(d) Date Design Complete	93 JUN 01	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	372	(b) All Other Design Costs	180	(c) Total	552	(d) Contract	439	(e) In-house	113
(a) Date Design Started	88 DEC 22																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	90 SEP 15																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 JUN 01																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	372																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	180																							
(c) Total	552																							
(d) Contract	439																							
(e) In-house	113																							

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)		2. DATE	
AIR FORCE					
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION			4. PROJECT TITLE		
ALTUS AIR FORCE BASE, OKLAHOMA			C-17 FIRE STATION (DBOF)		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT	6. CATEGORY CODE	7. PROJECT NUMBER	8. PROJECT COST(\$000)		
4.11.30M	130-142	AGGN943000	780		
9. COST ESTIMATES					
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
C-17 FIRE STATION (DBOF)		SF	2,600	110	286
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					415
UTILITIES		LS			(150)
PAVEMENTS		LS			(250)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(15)
SUBTOTAL					701
CONTINGENCY (5%)					35
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					736
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					44
TOTAL REQUEST					780
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					780
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Concrete footings, foundation, and floor slab, masonry walls, steel joists, roof decking, and sloped roof. Extend utilities as necessary, and construct asphalt access road. Air Conditioning: 5 Tons.					
11. REQUIREMENT: 19,100 SF ADEQUATE: 16,500 SF SUBSTANDARD: 0 PROJECT: Construct C-17 fire station. (New Mission) REQUIREMENT: A secondary fire station is needed to safeguard aircrews and aircraft on the assault strip (FY91 MILCON) and parallel runway (FY92 MILCON). This fire station will allow prepositioning of crash-rescue vehicles in close proximity to these new launch and recovery surfaces. CURRENT SITUATION: Air Force regulations require that the fire department be able to respond to an unannounced aircraft emergency anywhere on the airfield within three minutes. Vehicles located at the base's single fire station cannot meet the response requirement to the new launch and recovery surfaces. IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: Aircrew and aircraft will be at higher risk due to lack of fire protection in close proximity. Crash equipment will have to travel up to one mile further before they arrive at the accident scene. Minor accidents may become more severe, possibly resulting in the unnecessary loss of life, if the fire department cannot respond within three minutes. The base's airlift training and aerial refueling missions will be put at higher risk. ADDITIONAL: There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements". Project has been considered for FY97 force structure end strength.					

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ALTUS AIR FORCE BASE, OKLAHOMA																								
4. PROJECT TITLE C-17 FIRE STATION (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER AGGN943000																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="360 636 1410 762"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 AUG 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 SEP 17</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 MAY 21</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="360 827 1331 888"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$00C)</p> <table data-bbox="360 953 1410 1108"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>47</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>67</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>114</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>82</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>32</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 FEB</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 AUG 15	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 SEP 17	(d) Date Design Complete	93 MAY 21	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	47	(b) All Other Design Costs	67	(c) Total	114	(d) Contract	82	(e) In-house	32
(a) Date Design Started	92 AUG 15																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 SEP 17																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 MAY 21																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	47																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	67																							
(c) Total	114																							
(d) Contract	82																							
(e) In-house	32																							

1. COMPONENT	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE
AIR FORCE				
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION			4. PROJECT TITLE	
ALTUS AIR FORCE BASE, OKLAHOMA			C-17 ADD TO FLIGHT SIMULATION TRAINING FACILITY, PHII (DBOF)	
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT	6. CATEGORY CODE	7. PROJECT NUMBER	8. PROJECT COST(\$000)	
4.11.30M	171-212	AGGN943004	2,850	
9. COST ESTIMATES				
ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
C-17 ADD TO FLIGHT SIMULATION TRAINING FACILITY, PHII (DBOF)	SF	12,400	165	2,046
SUPPORTING FACILITIES				375
UTILITIES	LS			(210)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS	LS			(55)
PAVEMENTS	SY	2,850	39	(110)
SUBTOTAL				2,421
CONTINGENCY (10%)				242
TOTAL CONTRACT COST				2,663
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)				160
TOTAL REQUEST				2,823
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)				2,850
EQUIPMENT FROM OTHER APPROPRIATIONS (NON-ADD)				(63,600)
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Concrete foundations, floor slab, masonry walls, high bay areas, and sloped roof. All special foundations and utilities systems to support the simulator equipment. Also included are supporting pavements for roads, parking and sidewalks. Air Conditioning: 50 Tons.				
11. REQUIREMENT: 127,667 SF ADEQUATE. 115,292 SF SUBSTANDARD: 0 PROJECT: Add to C-17 flight simulation training facility, phase 2 of 2. (New Mission) REQUIREMENT: Four bays are required to house new six-way flight simulators for the C-17 aircrew training program. These simulators will provide initial training, qualification, proficiency, and effective mission procedures training. These simulators are essential to provide hazardous emergency training procedures that otherwise could not be provided. For example, it would not be possible to actually fly three engine take offs safely. Facility construction is required in FY94 in order that the facility be construction complete in August 1995 to meet the simulator equipment delivery date of September 1995. CURRENT SITUATION: This project is the second phase of a two phase program to construct flight simulator facilities to support the beddown of the C-17 aircraft at this base. The first phase was approved in the FY91 MILCON program to support initial delivery of the new aircraft and construction will be completed in 1993. This request will provide the final three bays needed to support C-17 aircrew training requirements. Other existing simulator facilities are and will continue to be in use for C-141, C-5, and KC-135 aircrew training. There are no other facilities on base which can be upgraded to meet this requirement IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: The beddown of the C-17 aircraft could not be				

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ALTUS AIR FORCE BASE, OKLAHOMA		
4. PROJECT TITLE C-17 ADD TO FLIGHT SIMULATION TRAINING FACILITY, PHII (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER AGGN943004	
<p>accomplished without providing an adequate flight simulator facility for training aircrews. Delay in providing requested construction will be grounds for the simulator equipment vendor to renegotiate the contract to provide the three simulators. It is estimated that a new contract will result in a \$30 to \$40 million increase to purchase simulator equipment.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements". A preliminary analysis of reasonable options for accomplishing this project (status quo, renovation, addition and new construction) was done. It indicates there is only one option (addition) that will meet operational requirements. Because of this, a full economic analysis was not performed. A certificate of exception has been prepared. Project has been considered for FY97 force structure end strength.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																														
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ALTUS AIR FORCE BASE, OKLAHOMA																																
4. PROJECT TITLE C-17 ADD TO FLIGHT SIMULATION TRAINING FACILITY, PHII (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER AGGN943004																															
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="358 636 1410 764"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 JUL 16</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 AUG 16</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 JUN 11</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="358 829 1328 890"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="358 955 1410 1110"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>135</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>116</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>251</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>180</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>71</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 FEB</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations:</p> <table data-bbox="193 1400 1410 1556"> <thead> <tr> <th>EQUIPMENT NOMENCLATURE</th> <th>PROCURING APPROPRIATION</th> <th>FISCAL YEAR APPROPRIATED OR REQUESTED</th> <th>COST (\$000)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>C-17 FLIGHT SIMULATOR</td> <td>3080</td> <td>FY92</td> <td>63600</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			(a) Date Design Started	92 JUL 16	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 AUG 16	(d) Date Design Complete	93 JUN 11	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	135	(b) All Other Design Costs	116	(c) Total	251	(d) Contract	180	(e) In-house	71	EQUIPMENT NOMENCLATURE	PROCURING APPROPRIATION	FISCAL YEAR APPROPRIATED OR REQUESTED	COST (\$000)	C-17 FLIGHT SIMULATOR	3080	FY92	63600
(a) Date Design Started	92 JUL 16																															
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																															
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 AUG 16																															
(d) Date Design Complete	93 JUN 11																															
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																															
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																															
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	135																															
(b) All Other Design Costs	116																															
(c) Total	251																															
(d) Contract	180																															
(e) In-house	71																															
EQUIPMENT NOMENCLATURE	PROCURING APPROPRIATION	FISCAL YEAR APPROPRIATED OR REQUESTED	COST (\$000)																													
C-17 FLIGHT SIMULATOR	3080	FY92	63600																													

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)		2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ALTUS AIR FORCE BASE, OKLAHOMA			4. PROJECT TITLE C-17 ADD TO AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE FACILITY (DBOF)		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 4.11.30M	6. CATEGORY CODE 218-712	7. PROJECT NUMBER AGGN923002	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 3,300		
9. COST ESTIMATES					
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
C-17 ADD TO AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE FACILITY (DBOF)		SF	27,000		2,518
AEROSPACE GROUND EQUIPMENT ADDITION		SF	8,200	100	(820)
AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE UNIT ADDITION		SF	12,000	86	(1,032)
EQUIPMENT SHOP/STORAGE ADDITION		SF	6,800	98	(666)
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					295
UTILITIES		LS			(100)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(85)
PAVEMENTS		LS			(60)
FUEL DISPENSING/STORAGE		LS			(50)
SUBTOTAL					2,813
CONTINGENCY (10%)					281
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					3,094
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					186
TOTAL REQUEST					3,280
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					3,300
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Addition to Aircraft Ground Equipment (AGE) Shop will have concrete footings, foundation and floor slab with high bay steel frame, insulated walls and roof and overhead two ton hoist. Addition to the Aircraft Maintenance Unit (AMU) will be a steel framed mezzanine, latrines, utilities and necessary support.					
11. REQUIREMENT: As required. PROJECT: Add to C-17 aircraft maintenance facility. (New Mission) REQUIREMENT: Properly sized and configured facility for maintenance, repair and storage of powered aircraft support equipment including administrative support, tools, maintenance equipment, bench stock, technical data library and battery storage to support the beddown of the C-17 aircraft. A properly sized Aircraft Maintenance Unit (AMU) is required for the displaced C-5 AMU in Building 279 (AGE Shop) and the new C-17 AMU to provide adequate administrative support, tool kit storage area, change rooms, and technical data library to support each weapon system. CURRENT SITUATION: The existing aircraft support shop is not properly configured, sized to support the new mission. The existing facility does not allow for easy access to maintenance bays for daily maintenance or storage to prevent damage from inclement weather. Equipment awaiting parts must be secured and placed outside to allow other equipment to be maintained. There are no other facilities available to house the new C-17 AMU or the C-5 AMU relocated with this project without construction of additional space. IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: It will not be possible to provide adequate aircraft support equipment maintenance and AMU space for the new C-17 aircraft and AMU space to support the C-5 aircraft. Lack of functional					

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ALTUS AIR FORCE BASE, OKLAHOMA		
4. PROJECT TITLE C-17 ADD TO AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE FACILITY (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER AGGN923002	
<p>AGE and AMU facilities will delay aircraft generation, and in some cases, loss of critical training missions.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements". An economic analysis has been prepared which supports this project. Project has been considered for FY97 force structure end strength.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ALTUS AIR FORCE BASE, OKLAHOMA																								
4. PROJECT TITLE C-17 ADD TO AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE FACILITY (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER AGGN923002																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 AUG 16</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 SEP 17</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 MAY 21</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>200</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>187</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>387</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>239</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>148</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 AUG 16	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 SEP 17	(d) Date Design Complete	93 MAY 21	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	200	(b) All Other Design Costs	187	(c) Total	387	(d) Contract	239	(e) In-house	148
(a) Date Design Started	92 AUG 16																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 SEP 17																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 MAY 21																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	200																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	187																							
(c) Total	387																							
(d) Contract	239																							
(e) In-house	148																							

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)		2. DATE	
AIR FORCE					
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION			4. PROJECT TITLE		
TINKER AIR FORCE BASE, OKLAHOMA			INDUSTRIAL WASTEWATER REGIONAL CONNECTION (DBOF)		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT	6. CATEGORY CODE	7. PROJECT NUMBER	8. PROJECT COST(\$000)		
7.80.56	831-155	WWYK943011	5,400		
9. COST ESTIMATES					
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
INDUSTRIAL WASTEWATER REGIONAL CONNECTION (DBOF)		LS			3,650
INDUSTRIAL WASTEWATER LINES		LF	15,000	170	(2,550)
LIFT STATIONS		EA	2	550,000	(1,100)
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					1,175
UTILITIES		LS			(225)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(300)
LEAK MONITORING SYSTEM		LS			(400)
COMMINUTOR		LS			(250)
SUBTOTAL					4,825
CONTINGENCY (5%)					241
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					5,066
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					304
TOTAL REQUEST					5,370
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					5,400
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Install a force and gravity flow wastewater connection main with an interstitial monitoring system. Includes pumps, valves, ancillary items and necessary support.					
11. REQUIREMENT: As required.					
<u>PROJECT:</u> Install a wastewater regional connection pipeline. (Current Mission)					
<u>REQUIREMENT:</u> This is a Level II environmental compliance project to provide a connection to the local municipal sewage collection system to allow Tinker AFB to meet permitted effluent limitations for wastewater discharge from the two base treatment plants. A sewage lift station and a section of forced mains are required to pump the effluent uphill from the base treatment plants, and a comminutor is needed to grind solids in the wastewater. Connection must be provided by August 1995 to ensure compliance.					
<u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> Effluent from the existing industrial wastewater treatment plant (IWTP) and sanitary treatment plant (STP) discharges into an intermittent creek. The low water to effluent ratio at the point of discharge results in very low permit discharge limits for many constituents. The plants have a history of noncompliance. Both plants are barely meeting discharge limits. The current base discharge permit expires in August 1993. The state has indicated that upon renewal, the base's permit will contain even lower limits to meet Clean Water Act, Section 304(1) requirements for toxicity control. The IWTP could not meet lower limits without the benefit of a major upgrade. Upon completion of this project the IWTP would be retained as a pretreatment facility and the STP will be closed.					
<u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> The base industrial wastewater treatment plant					

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION TINKER AIR FORCE BASE, OKLAHOMA		
4. PROJECT TITLE INDUSTRIAL WASTEWATER REGIONAL CONNECTION (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER WWYK943011	
<p>will continue to exceed National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permitted limits for effluent discharge. Potential fines and possible plant closure may result. Plant closure will shut down critical depot maintenance operations, severely crippling depot mission accomplishment.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There is no criteria/scope for this project in either Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide" or AFM 86-2. All known alternative options were considered during the development of this project. No other option could meet the mission requirements; therefore, no economic analysis was needed or performed. A certificate of exemption has been prepared.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION TINKER AIR FORCE BASE, OKLAHOMA																								
4. PROJECT TITLE INDUSTRIAL WASTEWATER REGIONAL CONNECTION (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER WWYK943011																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="360 636 1433 768"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 AUG 16</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 OCT 06</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 DEC 01</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="360 831 1433 894"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="360 957 1433 1115"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>320</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>175</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>495</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>330</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>165</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 APR</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 AUG 16	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 OCT 06	(d) Date Design Complete	93 DEC 01	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	320	(b) All Other Design Costs	175	(c) Total	495	(d) Contract	330	(e) In-house	165
(a) Date Design Started	92 AUG 16																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 OCT 06																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 DEC 01																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	320																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	175																							
(c) Total	495																							
(d) Contract	330																							
(e) In-house	165																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION CHARLESTON AIR FORCE BASE, SOUTH CAROLINA		4. PROJECT TITLE FIRE TRAINING FACILITY (DBOF)		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 4.18.56	6. CATEGORY CODE 179-511	7. PROJECT NUMBER DKFX963500	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 1,100	
9. COST ESTIMATES				
ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
FIRE TRAINING FACILITY (DBOF)	EA	1	815,000	815
SUPPORTING FACILITIES				155
UTILITIES	LS			(60)
PAVEMENTS	SY	1,300	35	(45)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS	LS			(50)
SUBTOTAL				970
CONTINGENCY (5%)				49
TOTAL CONTRACT COST				1,019
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)				61
TOTAL REQUEST				1,080
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)				1,100
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Live fire training facility with large frame aircraft mock-up, polyethylene liner system, JP-4 fuel pump and piping system, commercial power hook-up, gravity oil/water separator, access road, effluent holding pond and all necessary support.				
11. REQUIREMENT: 1 LS ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 1 LS PROJECT: Construct fire training facility. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: This is a Level II environmental compliance project. A live fire training facility is required to meet all environmental and safety regulations. Live fire training exercises, an FAA quarterly requirement, enable fire fighters to maintain a high level of proficiency by extinguishing two types of live fires: mass fuel spills and three dimensional (running fuel) fires. These exercises, performed on mock-ups typical of the mission assigned aircraft, have created compliance problems with the Clean Water Act. An impermeable lining below the pit area is required to prevent waste oils and fuels from leaching into the ground and contaminating the groundwater. CURRENT SITUATION: The existing live fire training facility violated EPA pollution standards and was closed in 1984. It is inadequate for training as defined by Air Force regulation. The current aircraft mock-up is smaller than the required size and is not accessible for multi-directional approaches creating an artificial environment which limits the quality of training. The existing facility does not have high-density polyethylene flexible membrane liners and nets, a leak detection system, and spill containment capability. There are no environmentally approved live fire training facilities in the local area. IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: The existing facility is closed because it does not meet environmental requirements. Required live fire training for the				

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION CHARLESTON AIR FORCE BASE, SOUTH CAROLINA		
4. PROJECT TITLE FIRE TRAINING FACILITY (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER DKFX963500	
<p>assigned fire fighters is not available. Without the stress and realism that come only with live fires, the fire fighters lose proficiency in combating fires. The potential for loss of aircraft and life is increased.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There are no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". This project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements". Project has been considered for FY97 force structure end strength.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION CHARLESTON AIR FORCE BASE, SOUTH CAROLINA																								
4. PROJECT TITLE FIRE TRAINING FACILITY (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER DKFX963500																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="355 625 1404 766"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 JUN 30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>65%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 SEP 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 JUN 25</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="355 819 1354 892"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>YES</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>SCOTT</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="355 945 1404 1113"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>57</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>19</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>76</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>57</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>19</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 JUN 30	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	65%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 SEP 15	(d) Date Design Complete	93 JUN 25	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	YES	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	SCOTT	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	57	(b) All Other Design Costs	19	(c) Total	76	(d) Contract	57	(e) In-house	19
(a) Date Design Started	92 JUN 30																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	65%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 SEP 15																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 JUN 25																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	YES																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	SCOTT																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	57																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	19																							
(c) Total	76																							
(d) Contract	57																							
(e) In-house	19																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)				2. DATE		
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION KELLY AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS				4. PROJECT TITLE C-17 ADAL NONDESTRUCTIVE INSPECTION FACILITY (DBOF)				
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 4.11.30L		6. CATEGORY CODE 211-153	7. PROJECT NUMBER MBPB943007		8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 4,900			
9. COST ESTIMATES								
ITEM					U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
C-17 ADAL NONDESTRUCTIVE INSPECTION FACILITY (DBOF)					SF	74,000		4,036
ALTERATION					SF	57,000	38	(2,166)
ADDITION					SF	17,000	110	(1,870)
SUPPORTING FACILITIES								170
UTILITIES					LS			(120)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS					LS			(50)
SUBTOTAL								4,266
CONTINGENCY (10%)								421
TOTAL CONTRACT COST								4,627
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)								278
TOTAL REQUEST								4,905
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)								4,900
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Addition includes concrete foundation and floor slab, metal walls and roof, relocation of hangar doors with new doors in the center section. Alteration includes upgrade of drainage and fire suppression systems, replacement of lighting and HVAC equipment, painting and necessary support.								
11. REQUIREMENT: 87,750 SF ADEQUATE: 13,750 SF SUBSTANDARD: 57,000 SF PROJECT: Add to and alter a C-17 nondestructive inspection (NDI) facility. (New Mission) <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> A properly sized and configured facility is required in which to perform nondestructive inspections on C-17 aircraft prior to the onset of depot maintenance operations at this base. The facility must be large enough to house the entire aircraft and must have adequate utilities and fire protection. An addition to the existing hangar is needed to enclose the C-17 empennage section and revitalization of the utilities is needed to ensure efficient and reliable inspections. <u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> The existing facility was constructed in 1942 as an aircraft maintenance hangar. While the building is structurally sound, it is neither large enough nor high enough to enclose the C-17 tail section. Additionally, the heating and ventilation systems are marginal, while the industrial waste drains, lighting, hoists and fire protection system are inadequate for nondestructive inspection activities. <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Deferral of inspection workloads until space becomes available in the maintenance hangar, which will upset depot maintenance schedules and delay return of the aircraft to the using organization. <u>ADDITIONAL:</u> The requirement for this project was validated by the Joint Service Depot Maintenance Industrial Military Construction Review Panel in								

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION KELLY AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS		
4. PROJECT TITLE C-17 ADAL NONDESTRUCTIVE INSPECTION FACILITY (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER MBPB943007	
<p>May 1990. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". However, this project does meet the criteria/scope specified in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements". An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of new construction, revitalization, contracting and status quo operation. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternative, revitalization was found to be the most cost effective over the life of the project.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION KELLY AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS																								
4. PROJECT TITLE C-17 ADAL NONDESTRUCTIVE INSPECTION FACILITY (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER MBPB943007																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="360 632 1410 762"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 SEP 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 DEC 05</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 OCT 01</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="360 825 1328 888"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="360 951 1410 1108"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>275</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>117</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>392</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>275</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>117</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 SEP 15	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 DEC 05	(d) Date Design Complete	93 OCT 01	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	275	(b) All Other Design Costs	117	(c) Total	392	(d) Contract	275	(e) In-house	117
(a) Date Design Started	92 SEP 15																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 DEC 05																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 OCT 01																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	275																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	117																							
(c) Total	392																							
(d) Contract	275																							
(e) In-house	117																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION KELLY AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS		4. PROJECT TITLE C-17 ALTER DEPOT AVIONICS FACILITY (DBOF)			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 4.11.30L	6. CATEGORY CODE 217-712	7. PROJECT NUMBER MBPB933003	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 731		
9. COST ESTIMATES					
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
C-17 ALTER DEPOT AVIONICS FACILITY (DBOF)		SF	23,000	26	598
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					30
UTILITIES		LS			(30)
SUBTOTAL					628
CONTINGENCY (10%)					63
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					691
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					41
TOTAL REQUEST					732
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					731
EQUIPMENT FROM OTHER APPROPRIATIONS (NON-ADD)					(15,400)
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Installation of additional lighting, improved electric power, sound abatement and necessary support.					
11. REQUIREMENT: 220,900 SF ADEQUATE: 189,900 SF SUBSTANDARD: 23,000 SF <u>PROJECT:</u> Alter a C-17 depot avionics facility. (New Mission) <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> A suitable facility is required to provide a completely organic capability for depot repair and test of C-17 avionics systems and components to maintain combat readiness. Environmentally controlled areas for test and overhaul of shop-repairable components, radar and antenna array and radomes are required. Under the C-17 concept, the depot must also establish an avionics intermediate shop which will be used to test and repair line-replaceable units as well as some software associated with avionics. Minor alterations to an existing building are needed to satisfy this requirement. <u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> Even though the existing depot avionics shops are utilized to near capacity, reductions in other workloads will make space available to accommodate the C-17 workload within existing space; however, some of that space will have to be modified to accommodate state-of-the-art technologies associated with the C-17. Deficiencies include inadequate lighting, unconditioned electrical power and inadequate noise abatement. <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Most of the avionics support for the C-17 will have to be contracted out at greatly increased costs. More importantly, the divided repair responsibility will result in significant delays in completion of depot repairs and return of aircraft to operational units. <u>ADDITIONAL:</u> The requirement for this project was validated by the Joint Service Depot Maintenance Industrial Military Construction Review Panel in					

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION KELLY AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS		
4. PROJECT TITLE C-17 ALTER DEPOT AVIONICS FACILITY (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER MBPB933003	
<p>May 1990. There is no criteria/scope for this project in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide", or in Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements".</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																														
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION KELLY AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS																																
4. PROJECT TITLE C-17 ALTER DEPOT AVIONICS FACILITY (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER MBPB933003																															
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 SEP 05</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 NOV 20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 OCT 14</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>43</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>66</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>109</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>56</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>53</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations:</p> <table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th>EQUIPMENT NOMENCLATURE</th> <th>PROCURING APPROPRIATION</th> <th>FISCAL YEAR APPROPRIATED OR REQUESTED</th> <th>COST (\$000)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>13 SHOP REPLACEABLE UNIT TEST EQUIPMENT</td> <td>3010</td> <td>FY94</td> <td>15400</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			(a) Date Design Started	92 SEP 05	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 NOV 20	(d) Date Design Complete	93 OCT 14	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	43	(b) All Other Design Costs	66	(c) Total	109	(d) Contract	56	(e) In-house	53	EQUIPMENT NOMENCLATURE	PROCURING APPROPRIATION	FISCAL YEAR APPROPRIATED OR REQUESTED	COST (\$000)	13 SHOP REPLACEABLE UNIT TEST EQUIPMENT	3010	FY94	15400
(a) Date Design Started	92 SEP 05																															
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																															
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 NOV 20																															
(d) Date Design Complete	93 OCT 14																															
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																															
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																															
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	43																															
(b) All Other Design Costs	66																															
(c) Total	109																															
(d) Contract	56																															
(e) In-house	53																															
EQUIPMENT NOMENCLATURE	PROCURING APPROPRIATION	FISCAL YEAR APPROPRIATED OR REQUESTED	COST (\$000)																													
13 SHOP REPLACEABLE UNIT TEST EQUIPMENT	3010	FY94	15400																													

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION KELLY AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS		4. PROJECT TITLE ALTER WEAPON SYSTEMS SUPPORT CENTER, PHASE II (DBOF)		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 7.28.96	6. CATEGORY CODE 610-675	7. PROJECT NUMBER MBPB943012	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 7,800	

9. COST ESTIMATES				
ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
ALTER WEAPON SYSTEMS SUPPORT CENTER, PHASE II (DBOF)	LS			5,770
INTERIOR ALTERATIONS	SF	130,000	29	(3,770)
EXTERIOR UPGRADE	LS			(2,000)
SUPPORTING FACILITIES				905
UTILITIES	LS			(200)
PAVEMENTS	SY	10,500	29	(305)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS	LS			(100)
DEMOLITION	LS			(300)
SUBTOTAL				6,675
CONTINGENCY (10%)				668
TOTAL CONTRACT COST				7,343
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)				441
TOTAL REQUEST				7,784
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)				7,800

10. Description of Proposed Construction: Interior alterations include new suspended ceiling and lighting, fire detection and suppression system, carpet, wall covering, asbestos removal, window/door replacement, HVAC and electrical system upgrade. Exterior work includes window and entrance improvements, painting, site clean-up and necessary support.
Air Conditioning: 30 Tons.

11. REQUIREMENT: 1,050,000 SF ADEQUATE: 729,600 SF
SUBSTANDARD: 607,500 SF
PROJECT: Alter a weapon systems support center. (Current Mission)
REQUIREMENT: A facility of adequate size and configuration with proper environmental controls is needed to assure timely and efficient logistical support to the managed weapon systems. Significant economies will result from collocation of logistics functions, directed by Defense Management Review (DMR) actions. These involve the acquisition, modification, repair and distribution of aircraft, engines and spare parts. Space savings envisioned in this project will make such a collocation possible without added floor space. This final phase will allow consolidation of material management functions currently located in remote buildings. Required improvements include installation of energy efficient doors, windows, lighting, and air conditioning, and replacement of worn out floor covering and asbestos ceilings.
CURRENT SITUATION: Core logistic functions are fragmented in five inadequate facilities separated by up to 1.5 miles. This fragmentation adversely impacts productivity and increases logistics response and pipeline times. The majority of the logistics professionals have been cramped into the inadequate Weapon Systems Support Center, which was constructed in 1942 as a warehouse and later converted to an administrative facility.

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION KELLY AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS		
4. PROJECT TITLE ALTER WEAPON SYSTEMS SUPPORT CENTER, PHASE II (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER MBPB943012	
<p>Projected force reductions resulting from the DMR, now make it possible to house all core logistics functions in the same building, if the floor plan is revised and building deficiencies corrected to accommodate long-term use. Building deficiencies include an unsafe electrical system (Risk Assessment Code 2 has been assigned), inadequate air conditioning, asbestos insulation and ceiling tiles, rotted window frames, and worn out exterior doors. The facility consumes energy at a rate 25% higher than a new or upgraded facility. Consolidation of functions will not only improve productivity, but will permit the demolition of about 28,000 square feet of substandard facilities upon completion of this project.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Continued fragmentation of core logistics personnel and processes will significantly degrade logistics support to other major commands and friendly foreign nations, weakening their combat readiness posture. It will also increase DOD logistical support costs, waste energy, and defeat zero overpricing initiatives.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of new construction, revitalization, leasing, private sector financing and status quo operation. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, revitalization was found to be the most cost efficient over the life of the project. This project meets the criteria/scope specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide".</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION KELLY AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS																								
4. PROJECT TITLE ALTER WEAPON SYSTEMS SUPPORT CENTER, PHASE II (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER MBPB943012																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="355 630 1404 766"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>91 APR 12</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>91 JUN 20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 JUN 30</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="355 819 1404 892"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="355 945 1404 1113"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>310</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>216</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>526</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>310</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>216</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	91 APR 12	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	50%	(c) Date 35% Designed	91 JUN 20	(d) Date Design Complete	93 JUN 30	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	310	(b) All Other Design Costs	216	(c) Total	526	(d) Contract	310	(e) In-house	216
(a) Date Design Started	91 APR 12																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	50%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	91 JUN 20																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 JUN 30																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	310																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	216																							
(c) Total	526																							
(d) Contract	310																							
(e) In-house	216																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE			
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION KELLY AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS				4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES (DBOF)				
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 7.28.96		6. CATEGORY CODE 721-312	7. PROJECT NUMBER MBPB867337		8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 2,000			
9. COST ESTIMATES								
ITEM					U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES (DBOF)					SF	28,650		1,500
ADDITION					SF	3,350	70	(235)
ALTERATIONS					SF	25,300	50	(1,265)
SUPPORTING FACILITIES						1		200
PAVEMENTS					LS			(125)
COMMUNICATIONS SUPPORT					LS			(25)
UTILITIES					LS			(25)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS					LS			(25)
SUBTOTAL								1,700
CONTINGENCY (10%)								170
TOTAL CONTRACT COST								1,870
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)								112
TOTAL REQUEST								1,982
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)								2,000
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Remodel interior partitioning to provide room-bathroom modules, exterior entrances and balconies; extend roofline and upgrade exterior; install cable TV system, upgrade laundry rooms and HVAC systems and provide necessary support. Grade Mix: 272 E1-E4.								
11. REQUIREMENT: 1,357 PN ADEQUATE: 1,085 PN SUBSTANDARD: 272 PN PROJECT: Add to and alter dormitories. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: A major Air Force objective is to provide unaccompanied enlisted personnel with housing that is conducive to their proper rest, relaxation, and personal well-being. Properly designed and furnished quarters, which provide some degree of individual privacy, are essential to the successful accomplishment of the increasingly complicated jobs these people must perform. CURRENT SITUATION: The buildings to be upgraded were constructed in the early 1950s with community latrines on each floor, and are deficient in living space, privacy, sound attenuation, convenience outlets, lighting, and insulation. Many occupants are shift workers who find that the traffic in the corridors make daytime sleep difficult or impossible. This is the fourth phase of a five-phased program. IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: Substandard on-base living conditions will continue to degrade the morale, productivity and career satisfaction of the enlisted force. ADDITIONAL: This project meets the criteria/scope specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of new construction and revitalization. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, revitalization was found to be the most cost								

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION KELLY AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS		
4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER MBPB867337	
efficient over the life of the project.		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION KELLY AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS																								
4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER MBPB867337																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="360 636 1410 764"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 OCT 17</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 DEC 30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>94 JAN 20</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="360 827 1328 890"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="360 953 1410 1110"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>120</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>200</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>320</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>290</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>30</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 MAR</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 OCT 17	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 DEC 30	(d) Date Design Complete	94 JAN 20	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	120	(b) All Other Design Costs	200	(c) Total	320	(d) Contract	290	(e) In-house	30
(a) Date Design Started	92 OCT 17																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 DEC 30																							
(d) Date Design Complete	94 JAN 20																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	120																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	200																							
(c) Total	320																							
(d) Contract	290																							
(e) In-house	30																							

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)		2. DATE	
AIR FORCE					
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION			4. PROJECT TITLE		
HILL AIR FORCE BASE UTAH			FIRE TRAINING FACILITY (DBOF)		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT	6. CATEGORY CODE	7. PROJECT NUMBER	8. PROJECT COST(\$000)		
7.80.56	179-511	KRSM933019	880		
9. COST ESTIMATES					
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
FIRE TRAINING FACILITY (DBOF)		EA	1	570,000	570
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					220
UTILITIES		LS			(130)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(90)
SUBTOTAL					790
CONTINGENCY (5%)					40
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					830
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)					50
TOTAL REQUEST					880
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)					880
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Live fire training pit with aircraft mock-up and associated environmental and safety systems (water separator, holding tank and berms). Includes utilities and necessary support.					
11. REQUIREMENT: 1 EA ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 1 EA					
<u>PROJECT:</u> Construct a fire training facility. (Current Mission)					
<u>REQUIREMENT:</u> This is a Level I environmental compliance project which will correct violations of existing statutes. A live fire training facility meeting all environmental and safety regulations is required. FAA requires quarterly live fire training exercises to enable fire fighters to maintain a high level of proficiency by extinguishing two types of live fires: mass fuel spills and three dimensional (running fuel) fires. These exercises, performed on mock-ups typical of the mission assigned aircraft, have historically created compliance problems with the Clean Water Act. An impermeable lining below the pit area is required to prevent waste oils and fuels from leaching into the ground and to prevent groundwater from becoming contaminated by residual unburned fuel.					
<u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> The live fire training facility at this base does not meet the standards established for this type of facility by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). While this facility is currently used on a limited basis, the lining and other environmental control measures do not meet requirements of the new Clean Water Act. Alternative training methods have been considered, but all have proven non-productive. Off-base training is not acceptable since it would remove both the crews and fire vehicles from the base, making them unavailable for response to emergencies.					

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION HILL AIR FORCE BASE, UTAH		
4. PROJECT TITLE FIRE TRAINING FACILITY (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER KRSM933019	
<p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Base fire crews will continue to be denied FAA required live fire training, adversely impacting their degree of readiness. Lack of training could result in injury, loss of life, or loss of an aircraft.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There is no criteria/scope for this project in either Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide" or AFM 86-2.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION HILL AIR FORCE BASE, UTAH																								
4. PROJECT TITLE FIRE TRAINING FACILITY (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER KRSM933019																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="370 636 1433 762"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 JUL 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 OCT 21</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 SEP 15</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="370 827 1433 888"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>YES</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>MT HOME</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="370 953 1433 1108"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>53</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>60</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>113</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>47</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>66</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 93 DEC</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 JUL 15	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 OCT 21	(d) Date Design Complete	93 SEP 15	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	YES	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	MT HOME	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	53	(b) All Other Design Costs	60	(c) Total	113	(d) Contract	47	(e) In-house	66
(a) Date Design Started	92 JUL 15																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 OCT 21																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 SEP 15																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	YES																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	MT HOME																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	53																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	60																							
(c) Total	113																							
(d) Contract	47																							
(e) In-house	66																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION HILL AIR FORCE BASE, UTAH		4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE INDUSTRIAL WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT (DBOF)		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 7.80.56	6. CATEGORY CODE 831-155	7. PROJECT NUMBER KRSM943032	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 5,100	

9. COST ESTIMATES				
ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
UPGRADE INDUSTRIAL WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT (DBOF)	KG	1,500	2,290	3,435
SUPPORTING FACILITIES				945
UTILITIES	LS			(295)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS	LS			(155)
STORAGE BUILDING	SF	1,600	50	(80)
REMOVE CONTAMINATED SOIL	LS			(295)
O&M MANUAL, TRAINING AND START-UP	LS			(120)
SUBTOTAL				4,380
CONTINGENCY (10%)				438
TOTAL CONTRACT COST				4,818
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)				289
TOTAL REQUEST				5,107
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)				5,100

10. Description of Proposed Construction: Remove concrete tanks, install new processing equipment and automated control system, and replace instrumentation. Includes necessary piping, accessories and site work, removal of existing tanks, construction of a 1600 SF storage building, removal of contaminated soil as required, and 180 day start-up operation and system certification.

11. REQUIREMENT: 1,500 KG ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 1,500 KG
PROJECT: Upgrade an industrial wastewater treatment plant. (Current Mission)

REQUIREMENT: This is a Level II environmental compliance project. An adequate industrial wastewater treatment plant (IWTP) is required to remove pollutants from industrial wastewater generated from the depot's maintenance activities, including aircraft and jet engine overhaul, metal plating, painting and paint stripping. The treatment process must produce an effluent which meets the discharge pretreatment limits set by the North Davis County Sewer District. It is anticipated by 1995 that these pretreatment limits will be much lower as North Davis County further controls user discharges to allow themselves to meet lower Clean Water Act limits for toxicity and hazardous waste limits on sludge refuse.

CURRENT SITUATION: The existing IWTP, built in 1970 and expanded in 1979, operates between 300 and 600 gallons per minute (gpm). It cannot consistently remove metals to the low concentrations required by the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System permit prior to discharge into a local waterway. This permit expires December 31, 1994, at which time the discharge limits governing Hill will likely be far more restrictive. District officials have advised base officials that new limits will be provided by August 1993. The clarifiers are too small to

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION HILL AIR FORCE BASE, UTAH		
4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE INDUSTRIAL WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER KRSM943032	
<p>provide sufficient settling of heavy metals at flows above 350 gpm. The emergency spill tank does not have capacity to store over one hour's accumulation of wastes, and the grit chamber must be manually cleaned four or five times per year. The manual control system does not allow for real time monitoring of the plant's operating parameters, resulting in delays of up to 48 hours before necessary adjustments can be made. This situation resulted in 12 days of noncompliance leading to two notices of violation in FY 1991.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> The capability of the IWTP to stay in compliance with its permit limits, the Clean Water Act and RCRA will be in jeopardy. Fines or other enforcement actions, including shutdown or reduction of depot maintenance activities that generate wastewater, are a distinct possibility if the project is not provided.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> There is no criteria/scope for this project in either Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide" or Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements". A life cycle economic analysis has been performed comparing all reasonable options for accomplishing this project (status quo, renovation, new construction, and contracting out the function). This analysis indicates that alteration is clearly the best alternative over the life of the facility.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION HILL AIR FORCE BASE, UTAH																								
4. PROJECT TITLE UPGRADE INDUSTRIAL WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER KRSM943032																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="356 632 1405 758"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 JUL 02</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>92 DEC 01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 NOV 30</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="356 825 1339 888"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>YES</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>HILL</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="356 951 1405 1108"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>300</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>201</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>501</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>399</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>102</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 FEB</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 JUL 02	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%	(c) Date 35% Designed	92 DEC 01	(d) Date Design Complete	93 NOV 30	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	YES	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	HILL	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	300	(b) All Other Design Costs	201	(c) Total	501	(d) Contract	399	(e) In-house	102
(a) Date Design Started	92 JUL 02																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	35%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	92 DEC 01																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 NOV 30																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	YES																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	HILL																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	300																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	201																							
(c) Total	501																							
(d) Contract	399																							
(e) In-house	102																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION MCCHORD AIR FORCE BASE, WASHINGTON		4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES (DBOF)		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 4.18.96	6. CATEGORY CODE 721-312	7. PROJECT NUMBER PQWY933030	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 6,500	
9. COST ESTIMATES				
ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES (DBOF)	SF	63,800		5,075
ALTERATION	SF	49,600	82	(4,067)
ADDITION (BALCONIES)	SF	14,200	71	(1,008)
SUPPORTING FACILITIES				485
UTILITIES	LS			(245)
PAVEMENTS	LS			(120)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS	LS			(120)
SUBTOTAL				5,560
CONTINGENCY (10%)				556
TOTAL CONTRACT COST				6,116
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)				367
TOTAL REQUEST				6,483
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)				6,500
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Upgrade existing facility and construct addition for balcony entrances. Includes room-bath-room configuration, insulation and sound attenuation, utilities and other necessary support.				
11. REQUIREMENT: 1,770 PN ADEQUATE: 918 PN SUBSTANDARD: 819 PN <u>PROJECT:</u> Add to and alter dormitories. (Current Mission) <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> A major Air Force objective provides unaccompanied enlisted personnel with housing conducive to their proper rest, relaxation and personal well-being. Properly designed and furnished quarters providing some degree of individual privacy are essential to the successful accomplishment of the increasingly complicated and important jobs these people must perform. <u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> Existing unaccompanied personnel housing is far below current DOD standards. These dormitories have central latrines, inadequate control of heating, insufficient noise attenuation and lack the necessary amenities to adequately house enlisted personnel. This project will upgrade two facilities to meet current DOD standards and is phase three of a five-phase program to upgrade dorms at McChord. Current dormitory occupancy rate at McChord is 96 percent. <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Substandard living conditions on base and expensive off-base housing will continue to be a contributing factor to low morale, reduced productivity and dissatisfaction with Air Force life for unaccompanied enlisted personnel. <u>ADDITIONAL:</u> This project meets the criteria/scope specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". A life-cycle economic analysis has been performed comparing all reasonable options for accomplishing this project (status quo, renovation and new				

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION MCCHORD AIR FORCE BASE, WASHINGTON		
4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER PQWY933030	
<p>construction). This analysis indicates renovation is the most economical. Project has been considered for FY97 force structure end strength.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION MCCHORD AIR FORCE BASE, WASHINGTON																								
4. PROJECT TITLE ADD TO AND ALTER DORMITORIES (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER PQWY933030																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="351 630 1420 766"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 JUN 03</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>30%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>93 FEB 19</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 AUG 31</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="351 819 1420 892"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="351 945 1420 1113"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>295</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>266</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>561</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td>393</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>168</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 MAR</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 JUN 03	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	30%	(c) Date 35% Designed	93 FEB 19	(d) Date Design Complete	93 AUG 31	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	295	(b) All Other Design Costs	266	(c) Total	561	(d) Contract	393	(e) In-house	168
(a) Date Design Started	92 JUN 03																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	30%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	93 FEB 19																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 AUG 31																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	295																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	266																							
(c) Total	561																							
(d) Contract	393																							
(e) In-house	168																							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION MCCHORD AIR FORCE BASE, WASHINGTON		4. PROJECT TITLE CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER COMPLEX (DBOF)		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 4.18.96	6. CATEGORY CODE 740-884	7. PROJECT NUMBER POWY933011	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 4,400	

9. COST ESTIMATES				
ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER COMPLEX (DBOF)	SF	33,400		3,282
CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER (A)	SF	16,000	100	(1,600)
CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER (B)	SF	15,000	100	(1,500)
MECHANICAL SUPPORT FACILITY	SF	2,400	76	(182)
SUPPORTING FACILITIES				650
SITE IMPROVEMENTS	LS			(155)
UTILITIES	LS			(295)
PAVEMENTS	LS			(160)
DEMOLITION/ASBESTOS REMOVAL	SF	3,200	13	(40)
SUBTOTAL				3,932
CONTINGENCY (5%)				197
TOTAL CONTRACT COST				4,129
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6%)				248
TOTAL REQUEST				4,377
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)				4,400

10. Description of Proposed Construction: All structural, electrical and mechanical work necessary to construct two child development center facilities. Includes classrooms, kitchen, multipurpose rooms, nurseries, administrative space, mechanical equipment room and necessary support.
Air Conditioning: 40 Tons.

11. REQUIREMENT: 50,550 SF ADEQUATE: 19,564 SF SUBSTANDARD: 3,200 SF
PROJECT: Construct a child development center complex. (Current Mission)
REQUIREMENT: A complex which provides adequate space and environment for child development requirements and an atmosphere conducive to the needs of young dependent children of assigned military and civilian personnel. McChord has a total of 674 children of military and civilian families eligible for day care. Current space criteria restricts the size of child development centers to accommodate only 305 children in one facility. In order to provide the required space to support eligible children at this installation, two facilities are needed.
CURRENT SITUATION: The current facilities accommodate only 38 percent of the demand for child care. Changes in the make-up of the military and civilian population have increased the need for full-day child care development services. Single parents, dual working couples, and working spouses have changed the focus from a recreational support activity to a mission support program. Because more children stay at the center ten hours a day, five days a week, improved developmental care facilities must provide more adequate indoor and outdoor play space, learning centers, sleeping facilities and kitchen/food service areas. Expanded program requirements cannot be provided and the increased demand for child care cannot be met due to lack of space. Current waiting list for full-time day care is 384 children. Certified home care is available (35 homes care

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION MCCHORD AIR FORCE BASE, WASHINGTON		
4. PROJECT TITLE CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER COMPLEX (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER PQWY933011	
<p>for 210 children); however, additional facilities are required. One substandard facility will be disposed of upon completion of this project.</p> <p>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: Lack of quality and affordable child care contributes to employee absenteeism, low morale and has a negative impact on the military and civilian workforces.</p> <p>ADDITIONAL: This project meets the criteria/scope specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". A life-cycle economic analysis has been performed comparing all reasonable options for accomplishing this project (status quo, renovation and new construction). This analysis indicates the new construction alternative is the most economical. Project has been considered for FY97 force structure end strength.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION MCCHORD AIR FORCE BASE, WASHINGTON																								
4. PROJECT TITLE CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER COMPLEX (DBOF)	5. PROJECT NUMBER POWY933011																							
<p>12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:</p> <p>a. Estimated Design Data:</p> <p>(1) Status:</p> <table data-bbox="360 632 1410 758"> <tr> <td>(a) Date Design Started</td> <td>92 MAY 29</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93</td> <td>15%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Date 35% Designed</td> <td>93 JUL 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Date Design Complete</td> <td>93 DEC 04</td> </tr> </table> <p>(2) Basis:</p> <table data-bbox="360 825 1328 888"> <tr> <td>(a) Standard or Definitive Design -</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -</td> <td>N/A</td> </tr> </table> <p>(3) Total Cost (c) = (a) + (b) or (d) + (e): (\$000)</p> <table data-bbox="360 951 1410 1108"> <tr> <td>(a) Production of Plans and Specifications</td> <td>273</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) All Other Design Costs</td> <td>114</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Total</td> <td>387</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Contract</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(e) In-house</td> <td>387</td> </tr> </table> <p>(4) Construction Start 94 MAR</p> <p>b. Equipment associated with this project will be provided from other appropriations: N/A</p>			(a) Date Design Started	92 MAY 29	(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	15%	(c) Date 35% Designed	93 JUL 15	(d) Date Design Complete	93 DEC 04	(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO	(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A	(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	273	(b) All Other Design Costs	114	(c) Total	387	(d) Contract		(e) In-house	387
(a) Date Design Started	92 MAY 29																							
(b) Percent Complete as of Jan 93	15%																							
(c) Date 35% Designed	93 JUL 15																							
(d) Date Design Complete	93 DEC 04																							
(a) Standard or Definitive Design -	NO																							
(b) Where Design Was Most Recently Used -	N/A																							
(a) Production of Plans and Specifications	273																							
(b) All Other Design Costs	114																							
(c) Total	387																							
(d) Contract																								
(e) In-house	387																							

FAMILY HOUSING

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING
FY 1994 BUDGET REQUEST

FY 1994 NARRATIVE SUMMARY

It is the Department of Defense policy that excellent housing facilities be provided for all military members and their families and continual improvement in quality be the measure of excellence. The annual military family housing appropriation supports this policy. We depend first on the local community to meet our housing needs. When not available, military family housing should meet contemporary community living standards. Our housing inventory should be operated and maintained to a standard that protects it from deterioration and maintains the quality level established by previous Congressional appropriations. Our goal is to provide quality homes that meet contemporary whole-house standards.

Family housing is one of the most important quality of life issues in the Air Force. Improving or replacing our aging housing inventory is a top facility priority. Our military members and their families expect and deserve homes which meet current standards of livability. In the era of downsizing, we cannot afford to lose highly trained Air Force members because adequate housing on or near our military installations is not available. Also, we cannot afford to let our existing military family housing inventory deteriorate, or fail to modernize it to reduce operating costs.

This budget provides a balanced program between construction, operations, maintenance, and leasing. Due to the uncertainty of basing in overseas areas, we have concentrated our construction efforts on housing in the CONUS. New construction projects for housing will replace worn-out and substandard homes in areas which violate airfield clearance and noise exposure criteria. We continue to propose projects to provide new support facilities at installations with the greatest need. The total construction funding level indicates the Air Force's dedicated commitment to replace or revitalize our existing inventory in order to meet contemporary standards. We are concentrating on our oldest homes located in the CONUS and replacing or improving as economic analysis indicates.

The operations, maintenance, and leasing accounts predominately support "must pay" requirements such as civilian pay, service contracts, lease contracts, utilities, and required maintenance to keep existing housing units from further deteriorating. The maintenance account also supports our goal to decrease the deferred maintenance and repair backlog to a one year real property maintenance level of approximately \$400 million over a ten year period. Also, the furnishings account provides for required government furniture overseas and initial issue of appliances to support new housing throughout the Air Force.

We believe this funding profile represents a well balanced program to achieve quality of life goals for military families within the fiscal constraints imposed. We respectfully request full and complete support for the Air Force family housing needs presented in this request.

INDEX

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING
FY 1994 BUDGET REQUEST

INDEX

<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
FAMILY HOUSING NARRATIVE	720
INDEX	721
SUMMARY	723
LEGISLATIVE LANGUAGE	724
Authorization	
Appropriation	
PROGRAM AND FINANCING SCHEDULES	727
NEW CONSTRUCTION	
Current Mission	732
Summary	733
Maxwell AFB AL	734
Vandenberg AFB CA	738
Patrick AFB FL	742
Tyndall AFB FL	746
Robins AFB GA	748
Barksdale AFB LA	752
Hanscom AFB MA	756
Lackland AFB TX	760
Fairchild AFB WA	764
F.W.Warren AFB WY	768
Comiso AS, IT	772
Little Rock AFB AR	773
Malmstrom AFB MT	774
Dyess AFB TX	775
Langley AFB VA	777
POST ACQUISITION CONSTRUCTION	
Summary	780
United States	
Alaska	782
Arizona	782

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING
FY 1994 BUDGET REQUEST

INDEX (con't)

United States (continued)	
California	783
Colorado	784
Florida	784
Idaho	785
Illinois	785
Ohio	786
South Carolina	786
Washington	787
Overseas	
Australia	788
Guam	788
Post Acquisition Construction Projects Over \$50,000 Per Unit	789
ADVANCE PLANNING AND DESIGN	808
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE SUMMARY	
Narrative	810
Inventory and Funding Summary	813
OPERATIONS	814
UTILITIES	818
MAINTENANCE	820
MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR OVER \$15,000 PER UNIT	823
GENERAL AND FLAG OFFICER QUARTERS	826
REIMBURSABLE PROGRAM	828
LEASING	
Narrative	829
Exhibit FH-4, Leasing (Other than Section 801 & 802)	832
Exhibit FH-4A, High Cost Foreign Leased Units	833
Exhibit FH-5, Section 801 Leases	834
DEBT PAYMENTS	836

SUMMARY

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING
FY 1994 BUDGET REQUEST

FINANCIAL SUMMARY

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATION REQUESTED FOR FY 1994
(\$ in Thousands):

FUNDING PROGRAM

FY 1994

Construction		\$ 110,264
Post-Acquisition Construction		53,070
Design and Advance Planning		<u>9,901</u>
<u>Appropriation Request: Construction</u>		<u>\$ 173,235</u>
Operations, Utilities and Maintenance		\$ 735,625
Operating Expenses	120,647	
Utilities	211,036	
Maintenance	403,942	
Leasing - Worldwide		\$ 118,266
Debt Payment		\$ 21
Premiums for Servicemen's		
Mortgage Insurance Coverage	21	
<u>Appropriation Request: O&M, Leasing,</u>		
<u>and Debt Payment</u>		<u>\$ 853,912</u>
<u>Appropriation Request</u>		<u>\$1,027,147</u>
Reimbursement Program		<u>\$ 9,397</u>
FY 1994 Family Housing Program		\$1,036,544

LEGISLATIVE LANGUAGE

LEGISLATIVE LANGUAGE

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING
FY 1994 BUDGET REQUEST

Authorization Language

SEC. 2302. FAMILY HOUSING

(a) CONSTRUCTION AND ACQUISITION. - Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2304(a)(7)(A), the Secretary of the Air Force may construct or acquire family housing units (including land acquisition) at the installations, for the purposes, and in the amounts set forth in the following table:

<u>STATE</u>	<u>INSTALLATION</u>	<u>PURPOSE</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
Alabama	Maxwell AFB	55 Units	\$ 4,080,000
Arkansas	Little Rock AFB	Housing Office & Maint Fac	\$ 980,000
California	Vandenberg AFB	166 Units	\$21,907,000
Florida	Patrick AFB	155 Units	\$15,388,000
	Tyndall AFB	Infrastructure	\$ 5,732,000
Georgia	Robins AFB	118 Units	\$ 7,424,000
Louisiana	Barksdale AFB	118 Units	\$ 8,578,000
Massachusetts	Hanscom AFB	48 Units	\$ 5,135,000
Montana	Malmstrom AFB	Housing Office	\$ 581,000
Texas	Dyess AFB	Housing Maint Facility	\$ 281,000
	Lackland AFB	111 Units	\$ 8,770,000
Virginia	Langley AFB	Housing Office	\$ 452,000
Washington	Fairchild AFB	1 Unit	\$ 184,000
Wyoming	F.E. Warren AFB	104 Units	\$10,572,000
Italy	Comiso AB	460 Units	\$20,200,000

(b) PLANNING AND DESIGN. - Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2304(a)(5)(A), the Secretary of the Air Force may carry out architectural and engineering services and construction design activities with respect to the construction or improvement of military family housing units in an amount not to exceed \$9,901,000.

SEC. 2303. IMPROVEMENT TO MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING UNITS

Subject to section 2825 of Title 10, United States Code, using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2304(a)(7)(A), the Secretary of the Air Force may improve existing military family housing units in an amount not to exceed \$53,070,000.

SEC. 2304. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, AIR FORCE

(a) IN GENERAL

(7) For military family housing functions -

(A) For construction and acquisition of military family housing and facilities, \$173,235,000.

(B) For support of military family housing (including functions described in section 2833 of title 10, United States Code), \$853,912,000, of which not more than \$118,266,000 may be obligated or expended for leasing of military family housing units worldwide.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING
FY 1994 BUDGET REQUEST

Appropriation Language

For expenses of family housing for the Air Force for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension and alteration and for operations and maintenance, including debt payment, leasing, minor construction, and insurance premiums, as authorized by law as follows: for Construction, (\$283,786,000) \$173,235,000, for Operations and Maintenance, and Debt Payment (\$927,941,000) \$853,912,000; in all (\$1,211,727,000) \$1,027,147,000: Provided: That the amount provided for construction shall remain available until (September 30, 1997) September 30, 1998.

PROG & FIN SCHEDULES

Family Housing Construction, Air Force
Program and Financing (in Thousands of dollars) SUMMARY

		Budget Plan (amounts for FAMILY HOUSING actions programmed)	
		1992 actual	1993 est. 1994 est.

Identification code	57-7040-0-1-051		
Program by activities:			
Direct program:			
01.0101	Construction of new housing	70,047	126,329 110,264
01.0201	Post Acquisition Construction	141,236	150,000 53,070
01.0301	Planning and design	6,500	7,457 9,901
01.9101	Total direct program	217,783	283,786 173,235
01.0101	Reimbursable Program	334	
10.0001	Total	218,117	283,786 173,235

Financing:			
Offsetting collections from:			
14.0001	Non-federal sources(-)	-334	
17.0001	Recovery of prior year obligations		
21.4002	Unobligated balance available, start of year:		
21.4009	For completion of prior year budget plans	-3,597	
22.0001	Reprograming from/to prior year budget plans	-8,500	
24.0002	Unobligated balance transferred from other accounts (-)		
24.0002	Unobligated balance available, end of year:		
26.0001	For completion of prior year budget plans	3,597	
26.0001	Unobligated balance expiring		
40.0001	Budget authority (Appropriation)	209,283	283,786 173,235

Relation of obligations to outlays:			
71.0001	Obligations incurred		
72.4001	Obligated balance, start of year		
74.4001	Obligated balance, end of year		
77.0001	Adjustments in expired accounts (net)		
78.0001	Adjustments in unexpired accounts		
90.0001	Outlays (net)		

Family Housing Construction, Air Force
Program and Financing (in Thousands of dollars) SUMMARY REPORT 21

Identification code	57-7040-0-1-051	1992 actual	1993 est.	1994 est.
Program by activities:				
Direct program:				
01.0101	Construction of new housing	28,005	112,473	141,465
01.0201	Post Acquisition Construction	102,781	231,801	72,226
01.0301	Planning and design	7,652	11,278	9,982
01.9101	Total direct program	139,438	355,552	223,673
01.0101	Reimbursable Program			
10.0001	Total	139,438	355,552	223,673
Financing:				
Offsetting collections from:				
14.0001	Non-Federal sources(-)	-334		
17.0001	Recovery of prior year obligations	-7,154		
21.4002	Unobligated balance available, start of year:			
21.4009	For completion of prior year budget plans	-118,092	-200,328	-128,562
22.0001	Reprogramming from/to prior year budget plans	-8,500		
24.4002	Unobligated balance transferred from other accounts (-)	200,328	128,562	78,124
25.0001	Unobligated balance available, end of year:	3,597		
	For completion of prior year budget plans.			
26.0001	Unobligated balance expiring			
40.0001	Budget authority (Appropriation)	209,283	289,786	173,235
Relation of obligations to outlays:				
71.0001	Obligations incurred	139,104	355,552	223,673
72.4001	Obligated balance, start of year	181,447	218,931	415,685
74.4001	Obligated balance, end of year	-218,931	-415,685	-414,967
77.0001	Adjustments in expired accounts (net)	-2,025		
78.0001	Adjustments in unexpired accounts	-7,154		
90.0001	Outlays (net)	92,442	158,798	224,391

7040F

Family Housing Construction, Air Force
Object Classification (in thousands of dollars) SUMMARY

Identification code	57-7040-0-1-051	1992 actual	1993 est.	1994 est.
Direct obligations:				
132.001 Land and structures	139,438	355,552	223,673	
199.001 Total Direct obligations	139,438	355,552	223,673	
999.901 Total obligations	139,438	355,552	223,673	

Family Housing Operations & Debt, AF
Program and Financing (in Thousands of dollars)

Identification code	57-7045-0-1-051	1992 actual	1993 est.	1994 est.
Program by activities:				
Direct program:				
02.0101	Operating expenses	341,465	389,475	331,683
02.0201	Leasing	117,448	150,800	118,268
02.0301	Maintenance of real property	442,320	387,596	403,942
02.0501	Mortgage insurance premiums	80	70	21
02.9101	Total direct program	901,313	927,941	853,912
03.0101	Reimbursable Program	8,978	8,275	9,397
10.0001	Total obligations	910,291	936,216	863,309
Financing:				
Offsetting collections from:				
11.0001	Federal funds(-)	-1,175	-7,199	-7,227
14.0001	Non-federal sources(-)	-7,803	-1,076	-2,170
22.0001	Unobligated balance transferred from other accounts (-)	-30,300		
25.0001	Unobligated balance expiring	32,167		
40.0001	Budget authority (Appropriation)	903,200	927,941	853,912
Relation of obligations to outlays:				
71.0001	Obligations incurred	901,313	927,941	853,912
72.4001	Obligated balance, start of year	274,482	347,931	351,736
74.4001	Obligated balance, end of year	-347,931	-351,736	-330,871
77.0001	Adjustments in expired accounts (net)	-16,003		
90.0001	Outlays (net)	811,861	924,136	874,777

Family Housing Operations & Debt, AF
Object Classification (in Thousands of dollars)

Identification code	57-7045-0-1-051	1992 actual	1993 est.	1994 est.
Direct obligations:				
121.001	Travel and transportation of persons	3,483	3,860	3,995
122.001	Transportation of things	6,967	7,720	4,515
123.201	Rental payments to others	227,281	181,066	184,209
125.203	Other services:			
	Contracts	252,546	279,837	243,246
125.204	Other	139,335	154,393	157,965
126.001	Supplies and materials	13,933	15,438	57,388
131.001	Equipment	49,542	48,248	19,094
132.001	Land and structures	191,585	212,290	183,500
143.001	Interest and dividends	22,641	25,089	---
199.001	Total Direct obligations	901,313	927,941	853,912
Reimbursable obligations:				
Other services:				
225.204	Other	8,978	8,275	9,397
299.001	Total Reimbursable obligations	8,978	8,275	9,397
999.901	Total obligations	910,291	936,216	863,309

NEW CONSTRUCTION

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING
FY 1994 BUDGET REQUEST

CURRENT MISSION ACTIVITIES

In compliance with the Senate Appropriations Committee Report (100-380) of the FY 1989 Military Construction Appropriation Act, the Air Force has included the following exhibit that displays construction projects requested in two separate categories: new mission and current mission. For FY 1994 we are only requesting funds for current mission. "Current mission" projects are those projects that either replace inadequate existing facilities or construct new facilities which are not available to meet current requirements.

NEW CONSTRUCTION

<u>LOCATIONS</u>		<u>NUMBER OF</u>	<u>REQUESTED AUTHORIZATION</u>
<u>REPLACEMENT HOUSING</u>	<u>MISSION</u>	<u>UNITS</u>	<u>AMOUNT (\$000)</u>
Maxwell AFB AL	Current	55	4,080
Vandenberg AFB CA	Current	166	21,907
Patrick AFB FL	Current	155	15,388
Tyndall AFB FL	Current	LS	5,732
Robins AFB GA	Current	118	7,424
Barksdale AFB LA	Current	118	8,578
Hanscom AFB MA	Current	48	5,135
Lackland AFB TX	Current	111	8,770
Fairchild AFB WA	Current	1	184
FE Warren AFB WY	Current	104	10,572
Comiso AF IT	Current	460	20,200
Little Rock AFB AR	Current	Hsg Ofc & Maint Fac	980
Malmstrom AFB MT	Current	Housing Office	581
Dyess AFB TX	Current	Housing Maint Fac	281
Langley AFB VA	Current	Housing Office	<u>452</u>
CURRENT MISSION TOTAL			110,264
IMPROVEMENTS			53,070
PLANNING AND DESIGN			9,901

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING
FY 1994 BUDGET REQUEST

NEW CONSTRUCTION

Program (In Thousands)
FY 1994 Program \$110,264
FY 1993 Program \$126,329

Purpose and Scope

This program provides for the replacement of existing homes where improvements are not economically feasible and acquisition of build/lease homes where purchase is more economical than continuous lease, and support facilities at locations where existing facilities are not adequate. Costs reflect all amounts necessary to provide complete and usable facilities.

Program Summary

Authorization is requested for:

Replacement of 876 units and 4 support facilities, and acquisition of 460 units through Lease Buy Out.

A summary of the funding program for FY 1994 follows:

<u>LOCATION</u>	<u>MISSION</u>	<u>NUMBER OF UNITS</u>	<u>REQUESTED AUTHORIZATION AMOUNT (\$000)</u>
<u>REPLACEMENT HOUSING</u>			
Maxwell AFB AL	Current	55	4,080
Vandenberg AFB CA	Current	166	21,907
Patrick AFB FL	Current	155	15,388
Tyndall AFB FL	Current	LS	5,732
Robins AFB GA	Current	118	7,424
Barksdale AFB LA	Current	118	8,578
Hanscom AFB MA	Current	48	5,135
Lackland AFB TX	Current	111	8,770
Fairchild AFB WA	Current	1	184
FE Warren AFB WY	Current	104	10,572
Comiso AB IT	Current	460	20,200
Little Rock AFB AR	Current	Hsg Ofc & Maint Fac	980
Malmstrom AFB MT	Current	Housing Office	581
Dyess AFB TX	Current	Housing Maint Fac	281
Langley AFB VA	Current	Housing Office	<u>452</u>
CURRENT MISSION TOTAL			110,264

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)						2. DATE			
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION MAXWELL AIR FORCE BASE, ALABAMA				4. COMMAND AIR UNIVERSITY			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX 0.77				
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			TOTAL
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	
a. As of 30 SEP 92		973	1600	1466	1556	46	14				5,655
b. End FY 1998		1202	2731	2306	1557	457	36	4	34	23	8,350
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (3,528)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)											196,253
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:											23,320
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:											4,080
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)											2,100
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:											0
g. Remaining Deficiency:											0
h. Grand Total:											225,753
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY			PROJECT TITLE			SCOPE		COST (\$000)		DESIGN STATUS	
<u>CODE</u>			<u>PROJECT TITLE</u>			<u>SCOPE</u>		<u>(\$000)</u>		<u>START</u> <u>CMPL</u>	
711-142			REPLACE FAMILY HOUSING			55 UN		4,080		TURN KEY	
						TOTAL:		4,080			
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995)											
711-142			REPLACE FAMILY HOUSING			25 UN		2,100			
						TOTAL:		2,100			
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
10. Mission or Major Functions: Headquarters Air University; Air War College; Air Command and Staff College; Squadron Officers School; Center for Aerospace Doctrine, Research, and Education; Air Force Quality Center; Ira C. Eaker Center for Professional Development; Air Force Historical Research Agency; Headquarters Air Force Reserve Officer Training Corps; Headquarters Civil Air Patrol; Community College of the Air Force; an Air Force Reserve airlift group (C-130 aircraft); and Air Mobility Command airlift squadron (C-21 aircraft).											

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)				2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION MAXWELL AIR FORCE BASE, ALABAMA				4. PROJECT TITLE REPLACE FAMILY HOUSING			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 8.87.41		6. CATEGORY CODE 711-142		7. PROJECT NUMBER PNQS944039		8. PROJECT COST (\$000) 4,080	
9. COST ESTIMATES							
ITEM				U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
REPLACE FAMILY HOUSING				UN	55	43,708	2,404
SUPPORTING FACILITIES							1,278
SITE PREPARATION				LS			(330)
ROADS AND PAVING				LS			(222)
UTILITIES				LS			(259)
LANDSCAPING				LS			(100)
RECREATION				LS			(42)
OTHER (SPECIFY) DEMOLITION				LS			(325)
SUBTOTAL							3,682
CONTINGENCY (5%)							184
TOTAL CONTRACT COST							3,866
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (5.5%)							213
TOTAL REQUEST							4,080
AREA COST FACTOR					.77		
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Replace 55 family housing units including all support facilities. Project will construct family housing units with associated carpports, storage, patios and privacy fencing. Housing will include heating, cooling, energy conservation features, carpeting and appliances. Supporting facilities include all site preparation, utilities, roads, parking, playground and landscaping.							
		NET	PROJECT	\$/	NO.		
	UNIT TYPE	AREA	FACTOR	NSF	UNITS	TOTAL COST	
	JNCO 2BR	950	.78	53	35	1,374,555	
	JNCO 3BR	1200	.78	53	14	694,512	
	JNCO 4BR	1350	.78	53	6	334,854	
					55	2,403,921	
11. <u>PROJECT</u> : Demolish fifty-six existing units and replace by constructing fifty-five new units. (Current Mission) <u>REQUIREMENT</u> : Project will provide adequate quarters for Air Force members and their families assigned to this installation. Project includes all work necessary to provide units meeting whole house/whole neighborhood criteria. <u>CURRENT SITUATION</u> : These Row units were constructed in 1941. The units are not energy efficient and housing density is overcrowded. The existing area will allow construction of only 55 units using current planning factors. Play areas for children and toddlers are below standards or nonexistent; presently the youngsters use the streets as playgrounds. Off-street parking does not meet minimum requirement of 2.5 parking spaces per unit nor one covered space. During rainy periods, roofs leak,							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION MAXWELL AIR FORCE BASE, ALABAMA		
4. PROJECT TITLE REPLACE FAMILY HOUSING	5. PROJECT NUMBER PNQS944039	
<p>damaging units as well as personal property of occupants. Existing electrical system does not meet National Electric Code requirements. All utilities systems have outlived life expectancy and need to be replaced. Expansion is required to alleviate lack of storage, cabinet, and counter space. Units are not compatible to reconfiguration. Kitchens and bathrooms are outdated and require complete renovation and/or replacement.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Air Force members and their families will continue to be housed in unsuitable conditions affecting morale, performance, and the retention of quality personnel.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of construction, improvement, leasing, and status quo operation. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, replacement construction was found to be the most cost effective over the life of the project. This project meets the criteria/scope specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide".</p>		

MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING JUSTIFICATION		1. DATE OF REPORT (YYMMDD)			2. FISCAL YEAR 1994		REPORT CONTROL SYMBOL DD-A&L (AR) 1716		
3. DOD COMPONENT AIR FORCE		4. REPORTING INSTALLATION a. NAME MAXWELL AIR FORCE BASE			b. LOCATION ADJACENT TO NORTHWEST CORNER OF MONTGOMERY, ALABAMA				
5. DATA AS OF 31 JANUARY 1992									
ANALYSIS OF REQUIREMENTS AND ASSETS		CURRENT				PROJECTED			
		OFFICER (a)	E9-E4 (b)	E3-E1 (c)	TOTAL (d)	OFFICER (e)	E9-E4 (f)	E3-E1 (g)	TOTAL (h)
6. TOTAL PERSONNEL STRENGTH		2,594	2,812	458	5,864	3,115	2,657	469	6,241
7. PERMANENT PARTY PERSONNEL		1,989	2,482	458	4,909	2,022	2,352	415	4,789
8. GROSS FAMILY HOUSING REQUIREMENTS		1,717	2,167	183	4,067	1,750	1,854	136	3,740
9. TOTAL UNACCEPTABLY HOUSED (a + b + c)		403	536	97	1,036				
a. INVOLUNTARILY SEPARATED		33	17	3	53				
b. IN MILITARY HOUSING TO BE DISPOSED/REPLACED			55		55				
c. UNACCEPTABLE HOUSED IN COMMUNITY		370	464	94	928				
10. VOLUNTARY SEPARATIONS		253	186	11	462	258	169	8	435
11. EFFECTIVE HOUSING REQUIREMENTS		1,464	1,969	172	3,605	1,492	1,685	128	3,305
12. HOUSING ASSETS (a + b)		1,136	1,507	75	2,718	1,136	1,508	75	2,719
a. UNDER MILITARY CONTROL		396	584		980	396	584		980
(1) HOUSED IN EXISTING DOD OWNED/CONTROLLED		328	569		897	396	584		980
(2) UNDER CONTRACT/APPROVED									
(3) VACANT		68	15		83				
(4) INACTIVE									
b. PRIVATE HOUSING		740	923	75	1,738	740	924	75	1,739
(1) ACCEPTABLY HOUSED		733	919	75	1,727				
(2) ACCEPTABLE VACANT RENTAL		7	4		11				
13. EFFECTIVE HOUSING DEFICIT		328	462	97	887	356	177	53	586
14. PROPOSED PROJECT							55		55
15. REMARKS (SPECIFY ITEM NUMBER)									
ITEM 6 - 13. BASIC DATA WERE EXTRACTED FROM THE FAMILY HOUSING SURVEY OF JANUARY 1992.									
ITEM 14. PROPOSED PROJECT.									
CONSTRUCT: 35 TWO BEDROOM UNITS FOR E4-E6 14 THREE BEDROOM UNITS FOR E4-E6 6 FOUR BEDROOM UNITS FOR E4-E6									

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)						2. DATE			
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION VANDENBERG AIR FORCE BASE, CALIFORNIA				4. COMMAND AIR FORCE SPACE COMMAND		5. AREA CONST COST INDEX 1.36				
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH	PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			TOTAL
	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	
a. As of 30 SEP 92	667	2650	1226							4,543
b. End FY 1998	638	2405	1217							4,260
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)										
a. Total Acreage: (98,831)										
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)										1,058,848
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:										67,750
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:										21,907
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)										16,460
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:										0
g. Remaining Deficiency:										0
h. Grand Total:										1,164,965
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994										
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE		SCOPE		COST	DESIGN STATUS			
CODE						(\$000)	START	Cmpl		
711-142	REPLACE CAPEHART HOUSING, PHASE 1		166 UN		21,907		TURN KEY			
						TOTAL:	21,907			
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995)										
711-142	FY70 APPROPRIATED FAMILY HSG		135 UN		16,460		TURN KEY			
						TOTAL:	16,460			
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:										
10. Mission or Major Functions: Headquarters Twentieth Air Force; a space wing which is responsible for operational and test launches of missiles, satellites, and space vehicles in polar orbits and for research and development of missile and space systems; a test wing responsible for ICBM operations test and evaluation launches; a missile evaluation squadron; a combat air rescue detachment (UH-1 helicopters); and an Air Training Command missile crew training squadron.										

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)				2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION VANDENBERG AIR FORCE BASE, CALIFORNIA			4. PROJECT TITLE REPLACE CAPEHART HOUSING, PHASE 1				
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 8.87.41		6. CATEGORY CODE 711-142	7. PROJECT NUMBER XUMU924014P1		8. PROJECT COST (\$000) 21,907		
9. COST ESTIMATES							
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)		
REPLACE FAMILY HOUSING		UN	166	77,304	12,832		
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					6,944		
SITE PREPARATION		LS			(1,422)		
ROADS AND PAVING		LS			(949)		
UTILITIES		LS			(2,055)		
LANDSCAPING		LS			(789)		
RECREATION		LS			(168)		
SPECIAL CONSTRUCTION FEATURES		LS			(1,561)		
SUBTOTAL					19,776		
CONTINGENCY (5%)					989		
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					20,765		
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (5.5%)					1,142		
TOTAL REQUEST					21,907		
AREA COST FACTOR		1.36					
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Replace 166 Capehart housing units. Work includes site preparation, landscaping, and provision of pedestrian/bike trails and recreational areas.							
	UNIT TYPE	NET AREA	PROJECT FACTOR	\$/NSF	NO. UNITS	TOTAL COST	
	JNCO 2BR	950	1.35	53	89	6,049,553	
	JNCO 3BR	1200	1.35	53	61	5,237,460	
	JNCO 4BR	1350	1.35	53	16	1,545,480	
					166	12,832,493	
11. REQUIREMENT: 1,733 UN ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 2,078 UN PROJECT: Replace 166 Capehart units. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: This is a replacement project to provide adequate housing for military personnel. CURRENT SITUATION: These units are over 30 years old and have deteriorated to the point where replacement is the most economical alternative. Wiring and fixtures have been identified by the Fire Department and Base Safety as not meeting code. Wiring is brittle and exposed in many units and is a fire hazard. Plumbing systems have succumbed to the effects of hard water and corrosion, resulting in severe constriction and pipe leakage. Plumbing fixtures are worn and unattractive. Main and master baths are deteriorated and outdated, having shower enclosures and medicine cabinets which are corroded, discolored, and pitted. Additionally, the way the units are presently configured is inefficient. IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: Air Force members and their families will							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION VANDENBERG AIR FORCE BASE, CALIFORNIA		
4. PROJECT TITLE REPLACE CAPEHART HOUSING, PHASE 1	5. PROJECT NUMBER XUMU924014P1	
<p>continue to be housed with inadequate water and electrical service. The occupants will suffer continual water leaks in their ceilings causing damage to the ceiling, light fixtures and furniture. Without the replacement of these units, repairs of these units will continue in a costly, piecemeal fashion, with no improvement in the quality of life for the occupants.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of new construction, revitalization, leasing and status quo operation. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, replacement was found to be the most cost efficient over the life of the project.</p>		

MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING JUSTIFICATION		1. DATE OF REPORT (YYMMDD)		2. FISCAL YEAR		REPORT CONTROL SYMBOL			
3. DOD COMPONENT AIR FORCE		4. REPORTING INSTALLATION		1994		DD-A&L (AR) 1716			
5. DATA AS OF 31 JANUARY 1992		a. NAME VANDENBERG AIR FORCE BASE		b. LOCATION ELEVEN MILES NORTH OF LOMPOC, CALIFORNIA					
ANALYSIS OF REQUIREMENTS AND ASSETS		CURRENT				PROJECTED			
		OFFICER (a)	E9-E4 (b)	E3-E1 (c)	TOTAL (d)	OFFICER (e)	E9-E4 (f)	E3-E1 (g)	TOTAL (h)
6. TOTAL PERSONNEL STRENGTH		820	2,145	520	3,485	646	1,898	713	3,257
7. PERMANENT PARTY PERSONNEL		703	2,145	520	3,368	646	1,898	713	3,257
8. GROSS FAMILY HOUSING REQUIREMENTS		572	1,676	174	2,422	497	1,366	224	2,107
9. TOTAL UNACCEPTABLY HOUSE (a + b + c)		6	184	2	192				
a. INVOLUNTARILY SEPARATED			5	2	7				
b. IN MILITARY HOUSING TO BE DISPOSED/REPLACED			173		173				
c. UNACCEPTABLE HOUSED IN COMMUNITY		6	6		12				
10. VOLUNTARY SEPARATIONS		6	80	3	89	5	66	4	75
11. EFFECTIVE HOUSING REQUIREMENTS		566	1,596	171	2,333	492	1,320	220	2,032
12. HOUSING ASSETS (a + b)		591	1,619	171	2,381	617	1,767	3	2,387
a. UNDER MILITARY CONTROL		463	1,340	168	1,971	485	1,486		1,971
(1) HOUSED IN EXISTING DOD OWNED/CONTROLLED		434	1,309	168	1,911	485	1,486		1,971
(2) UNDER CONTRACT/APPROVED									
(3) VACANT		29	31		60				
(4) INACTIVE									
b. PRIVATE HOUSING		128	279	3	410	132	281	3	416
(1) ACCEPTABLY HOUSED		128	276	1	403				
(2) ACCEPTABLE VACANT RENTAL		2	3	2	7				
13. EFFECTIVE HOUSING DEFICIT		-25	-23		-48	-125	-447	217	-355
14. PROPOSED PROJECT							166		166

15. REMARKS (SPECIFY ITEM NUMBER)

ITEM 6 - 13. BASIC DATA WERE EXTRACTED FROM THE FAMILY HOUSING SURVEY
JANUARY 1992.

ITEM 14. PROPOSED PROJECT.

CONSTRUCT: 89 TWO BEDROOM UNITS FOR E4-E6
61 THREE BEDROOM UNITS FOR E7-E9
16 FOUR BEDROOM UNITS FOR E4-E6

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)							2. DATE		
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION PATRICK AIR FORCE BASE, FLORIDA					4. COMMAND AIR FORCE SPACE COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX 0.91			
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			TOTAL
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	
a. As of 30 SEP 92		473	2317	1054				33	531	15	4,423
b. End FY 1998		462	1704	960				33	531	15	3,705
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (2,341)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)											148,294
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:											7,700
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:											15,388
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)											10,000
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:											0
g. Remaining Deficiency:											0
h. Grand Total:											181,382
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE			SCOPE		COST	DESIGN STATUS			
CODE						(\$000)	START	Cmpl			
711-142	REPLACE CENTRAL WHERRY HOUSING			155 UN		15,388	TURN	KEY			
						TOTAL:	15,388				
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995)											
711-142	REPLACE CENTRAL WHERRY HOUSING			105 UN		10,000	TURN	KEY			
			PHASE II								
						TOTAL:	10,000				
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
10. Mission or Major Functions: A space wing; the Air Force Technical Applications Center; two Air Mobility Command air rescue squadrons (HH-3 helicopters and HC-130 aircraft); and an Air Combat Command combat communications group. Also, the temporary beddown location for the Air Force Reserve air rescue squadron (MH-60 helicopters) from Homestead AFB, FL. Major tenants include the DOD Equal Opportunity Management Institute and a State Department aviation unit.											

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION PATRICK AIR FORCE BASE, FLORIDA		4. PROJECT TITLE REPLACE CENTRAL WHERRY HOUSING		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 8.87.41	6. CATEGORY CODE 711-142	7. PROJECT NUMBER SXHT944005	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 15,388	

9. COST ESTIMATES

ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
REPLACE FAMILY HOUSING	UN	155	58,156	9,014
SUPPORTING FACILITIES				4,877
GARAGES	LS			(1,068)
ASBESTOS ABATEMENT	LS			(730)
SITE PREPARATION	LS			(453)
ROADS AND PAVING	LS			(481)
UTILITIES	LS			(1,055)
LANDSCAPING	LS			(380)
RECREATION	LS			(90)
BUILDING DEMOLITION	LS			(620)
SUBTOTAL				13,891
CONTINGENCY (5%)				695
TOTAL CONTRACT COST				14,586
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (5.5%)				802
TOTAL REQUEST				15,388
AREA COST FACTOR		.91		

10. Description of Proposed Construction: Demolish 155 - (2/4) bedroom units in Central housing. Build/replace 155 - (2/4) bedroom units with attached or semi-attached garages in the Central housing area. This project will also include whole neighborhood improvements.

UNIT TYPE	NET AREA	PROJECT FACTOR	\$/NSF	NO. UNITS	TOTAL COST
JNCO 3BR	1200	.89	53	121	6,849,084
JNCO 4BR	1350	.89	53	34	2,165,103
				155	9,014,187

11. **PROJECT:** Replace 155 Wherry housing units. (Current Mission)
REQUIREMENT: This project is a replacement project to provide adequate housing for military personnel.
CURRENT SITUATION: The Patrick AFB units were constructed between 1952 and 1958 and consist of 245 officer quarters and 1,331 junior and senior enlisted quarters. 923 out of the total 1,576 units are undersized by more than 100 net square feet. 573 of the units were constructed with flat built-up gravel roofs. The built-up gravel roofs are over 15 years old and deteriorated to where they must be replaced. The exterior walls are concrete and stucco and have developed cracks that allow water and moisture intrusion to the interiors. Many of the wood porch components have deteriorated and the porches have been removed to prevent a safety hazard to the occupants. The infrastructure (sewer, water, electrical) have deteriorated beyond economic repair. The plumbing, electrical and heating/air conditioning systems inside the units have also deteriorated beyond economic repair. All units have asbestos in the tiles, walls,

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION PATRICK AIR FORCE BASE, FLORIDA		
4. PROJECT TITLE REPLACE CENTRAL WHERRY HOUSING	5. PROJECT NUMBER SXHT944005	
<p>ceilings, and exterior, and all units contain lead based paint. In the very near future a determination will be made as to the livability of the 311 units which contain friable asbestos. These units may have to be closed to occupant use for the safety of our military personnel.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Air Force members and their families would continue to be housed in unsatisfactory conditions, affecting morale and the retention of quality personnel. Ultimately, the mission of Patrick AFB would be degraded.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of new construction, revitalization, leasing and status quo operation. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, replacement was found to be the most cost efficient over the life of the project.</p>		

MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING JUSTIFICATION		1. DATE OF REPORT (YYMMDD)		2. FISCAL YEAR		REPORT CONTROL SYMBOL			
3. DOD COMPONENT AIR FORCE		4. REPORTING INSTALLATION		1994		DD-A&L (AR) 1718			
5. DATA AS OF MARCH 1991		a. NAME PATRICK AIR FORCE BASE		b. LOCATION THREE MILES SOUTH OF COCOA BEACH, FLORIDA					
ANALYSIS OF REQUIREMENTS AND ASSETS		CURRENT				PROJECTED			
		OFFICER (a)	E9-E4 (b)	E3-E1 (c)	TOTAL (d)	OFFICER (e)	E9-E4 (f)	E3-E1 (g)	TOTAL (h)
6. TOTAL PERSONNEL STRENGTH		667	2,431	447	3,545	665	2,448	397	3,510
7. PERMANENT PARTY PERSONNEL		667	2,431	447	3,545	665	2,448	397	3,510
8. GROSS FAMILY HOUSING REQUIREMENTS		501	1,705	164	2,370	499	1,716	145	2,360
9. TOTAL UNACCEPTABLE HOUSE (a + b + c)		29	262	7	298				
a. INVOLUNTARILY SEPARATED			4	3	7				
b. IN MILITARY HOUSING TO BE DISPOSED/REPLACED			161		161				
c. UNACCEPTABLE HOUSED IN COMMUNITY		29	97	4	130				
10. VOLUNTARY SEPARATIONS		9	95	10	114	9	94	8	111
11. EFFECTIVE HOUSING REQUIREMENTS		492	1,610	154	2,256	490	1,622	137	2,249
12. HOUSING ASSETS (a + b)		467	1,517	150	2,134	466	1,498	137	2,101
a. UNDER MILITARY CONTROL		168	1,245	140	1,553	168	1,248	137	1,553
(1) HOUSED IN EXISTING DOD OWNED/CONTROLLED		167	1,222	140	1,529	168	1,248	137	1,553
(2) UNDER CONTRACT/APPROVED									
(3) VACANT		1	23		24				
(4) INACTIVE									
b. PRIVATE HOUSING		299	272	10	581	298	250		548
(1) ACCEPTABLY HOUSED		296	268	10	573				
(2) ACCEPTABLE VACANT RENTAL		4	4		8				
13. EFFECTIVE HOUSING DEFICIT		25	93	4	122	24	124		148
14. PROPOSED PROJECT							155		155

15. REMARKS (SPECIFY ITEM NUMBER)

ITEM 6 - 13. BASIC DATA WERE EXTRACTED FROM THE HOUSING MARKET ANALYSIS OF MARCH 1991.

ITEM 14. PROPOSED PROJECT.

CONSTRUCT: 121 THREE BEDROOM UNITS FOR E4 - E6
34 FOUR BEDROOM UNITS FOR E4 - E6

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)				2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION TYNDALL AIR FORCE BASE, FLORIDA			4. PROJECT TITLE REPLACE FAMILY HOUSING PHASE 1 (INFRASTRUCTURE)				
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 8.87.41		6. CATEGORY CODE 711-311	7. PROJECT NUMBER XLWU940101		8. PROJECT COST (\$000) 5,732		
9. COST ESTIMATES							
ITEM			U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
REPLACE FAMILY HOUSING PHASE 1 (INFRASTRUCTURE)			LS			5,174	
SITE PREPARATION			LS			(517)	
ROADS & PAVEMENTS			LS			(1,578)	
UTILITIES			LS			(2,789)	
LANDSCAPING			LS			(114)	
RECREATION			LS			(176)	
SUBTOTAL						5,174	
CONTINGENCY (5%)						259	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST						5,433	
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (5.5%)						299	
TOTAL REQUEST						5,732	
AREA COST FACTOR			0.86				
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Construct roadways, streets, sidewalks, storm drainage, utilities, and all necessary infrastructure improvements to support the construction of 450 new MFH units. Includes recreation areas and all landscaping.							
11. <u>PROJECT</u> : Replace Family Housing, Phase 1 (Infrastructure). (Current Mission) <u>REQUIREMENT</u> : This project is required to provide adequate Military Family Housing to support military members and their families assigned to Tyndall AFB. This project is Phase 1 of a multi-phased project to construct 450 MFH units, and demolish 338 substandard MFH units. The first phase includes the installation of all necessary infrastructure for the construction of a new housing area. <u>CURRENT SITUATION</u> : The Wherry units to be replaced were constructed in the 1950s, and have received only routine maintenance and repair since that time. Age and continuous heavy use have taken their toll and the units are beyond economic feasibility to upgrade. The only feasible option for providing adequate housing is to demolish the existing 338 Wherry units, and construct replacement housing on another site located on the main base. Relocation is required, in part, by the fact that a portion of the Wherry Housing is located within Tyndall's airfield Accident Potential Zone One (APZ I), and by the fact that both Wherry Housing areas are negatively impacted by Air Installation Compatible Use Zones (AICUZ) (all Wherry units are in the 70 Ldn to 80 Ldn noise contours). In addition, many of the houses front on a busy four-lane divided highway. Existing assets on base, and in the local market area, cannot satisfy the total requirements for our military families. <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED</u> : Without this and subsequent phases of this							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION TYNDALL AIR FORCE BASE, FLORIDA		
4. PROJECT TITLE REPLACE FAMILY HOUSING PHASE 1 (INFRASTRUCTURE)	5. PROJECT NUMBER XLWU940101	
<p>initiative, repairs of the existing units will continue in a costly, piecemeal fashion, with no improvement in the quality of life for the occupants. Our inability to take better care of our military families will result in low morale and subsequent retention problems if such conditions are permitted to continue.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> This project meets the criteria/scope specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". An Economic Analysis has not been prepared for this infrastructure support project. However, an economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of new construction, improvement, leasing and status quo operation for the overall initiative to replace/construct 450 MPH units. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, new construction was found to be the most cost efficient over the life of the project.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)							2. DATE		
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ROBINS AIR FORCE BASE, GEORGIA					4. COMMAND AIR FORCE MATERIEL COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX 0.77			
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			TOTAL
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	
a. As of 30 SEP 92		754	3150	13599							17,503
b. End FY 1998		725	3025	11313							15,063
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (8,720)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92) 466,871											
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory: 61,720											
d. Authorization Requested In This Program: 7,424											
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995) 0											
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years: 0											
g. Remaining Deficiency: 0											
h. Grand Total: 536,015											
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE			SCOPE		COST (\$000)		DESIGN STATUS		
<u>CODE</u>									<u>START</u> <u>CMPL</u>		
711-142		REPLACE WHERRY HOUSING			118 UN		7,424		TURN KEY		
							TOTAL:		7,424		
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995) NONE											
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
10. Mission or Major Functions: Warner Robins Air Logistics Center which is responsible for logistics management, support, & depot-level maintenance of F-15, C-130, & C-141 aircraft, helicopters; tactical missiles, & avionics & electronic warfare systems; HQ AFRES; AMC air refueling wing with two KC-135 squadrons; ACC combat communications group; & an Air Force Space Command missile warning squadron which operates one of the Phased Array Warning System (Pave PAWS) radars. Also, the main operating base for the Joint Surveillance & Target Attack Radar System (JSTARS) aircraft.											

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)				2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ROBINS AIR FORCE BASE, GEORGIA				4. PROJECT TITLE REPLACE WHERRY HOUSING			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 8.87.41		6. CATEGORY CODE 711-142		7. PROJECT NUMBER UHHZ924014N2		8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 7,424	
9. COST ESTIMATES							
ITEM			U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
REPLACE WHERRY HOUSING			UN	118	45,742	5,398	
SUPPORTING FACILITIES						1,303	
SITE PREPARATION			LS			(215)	
ROADS AND PAVING			LS			(210)	
UTILITIES			LS			(220)	
LANDSCAPING			LS			(128)	
RECREATION			LS			(137)	
DEMOLITION			LS			(393)	
SUBTOTAL						6,701	
CONTINGENCY (5%)						335	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST						7,036	
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (5.5%)						387	
TOTAL REQUEST						7,424	
AREA COST FACTOR				.77			
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Replace 118 JNCO units. Build units to authorized square footage limits for two, three, and four bedroom JNCO housing. Exterior appurtenances to include carports, porches, and patios. Neighborhood improvements include recreation, utilities, landscaping, signage, and drainage.							
	<u>UNIT TYPE</u>	<u>NET AREA</u>	<u>PROJECT FACTOR</u>	<u>\$/NSF</u>	<u>NO. UNITS</u>	<u>TOTAL COST</u>	
	JNCO 2BR	950	.76	53	40	1,530,640	
	JNCO 3BR	1200	.76	53	62	2,996,832	
	JNCO 4BR	1350	.76	53	16	870,048	
					118	5,397,520	
11. <u>PROJECT</u> : provide replacements for 118 Wherry housing units. Build units to meet "whole house/whole neighborhood" standards. (Current Mission) <u>REQUIREMENT</u> : Replacement of these units is required to provide adequate quarters for junior military members and their families assigned to this installation. Provide units which meet current USAF or local standards and have the authorized net square footage. Provide carports, neighborhood sidewalks, and adequate recreation areas. <u>CURRENT SITUATION</u> : The Wherry housing area was constructed in the 1950s and has had only one interior improvement (1979) since then. The room sizes do not meet the minimum Air Force "whole house" standards. Functional layouts are inefficient and do not reflect contemporary styles. Carports are needed to protect occupants' vehicles from exposure to the elements. Driveways and off-street parking access will eliminate unsafe							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ROBINS AIR FORCE BASE, GEORGIA		
4. PROJECT TITLE REPLACE WHERRY HOUSING	5. PROJECT NUMBER UHHZ924014N2	
<p>on-street parking. These units do not have adequate storage for lawnmowers, bicycles and tools. Interior wall finishes need revitalization, and the existing electrical wiring does not meet code. Lack of adequate drainage causes problems with standing water. Existing plumbing and HVAC systems are antiquated and unreliable. Water heaters are inadequate. These units require high maintenance and are inefficient.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Junior enlisted members and their families will continue to be housed in unsuitable housing. The units will continue to require high levels of maintenance and energy consumption will remain high.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of construction, improvement, leasing and status quo operation. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, replacement construction was found to be the most cost effective over the life of the project. This project meets the criteria/scope specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide."</p>		

MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING JUSTIFICATION		1. DATE OF REPORT (YYMMDD)		2. FISCAL YEAR 1994		REPORT CONTROL SYMBOL DD-A&L(AF)1716			
3. DOD COMPONENT AIR FORCE		4. REPORTING INSTALLATION							
5. DATA AS OF JUNE 1992		a. NAME ROBINS AIR FORCE BASE		b. LOCATION EIGHTEEN MILES SOUTHEAST OF MACON, GEORGIA					
ANALYSIS OF REQUIREMENTS AND ASSETS		CURRENT				PROJECTED			
		OFFICER (a)	E9-E4 (b)	E3-E1 (c)	TOTAL (d)	OFFICER (e)	E9-E4 (f)	E3-E1 (g)	TOTAL (h)
6. TOTAL PERSONNEL STRENGTH		690	2,308	730	3,728	1,030	3,150	1,020	5,200
7. PERMANENT PARTY PERSONNEL		690	2,308	730	3,728	1,030	3,150	1,020	5,200
8. GROSS FAMILY HOUSING REQUIREMENTS		553	1,783	232	2,568	780	2,400	311	3,491
9. TOTAL UNACCEPTABLY HOUSED (a + b + c)		55	316	80	451				
a. INVOLUNTARILY SEPARATED		5	10	5	20				
b. IN MILITARY HOUSING TO BE DISPOSED/REPLACED			83		83				
c. UNACCEPTABLE HOUSED IN COMMUNITY		50	223	75	348				
10. VOLUNTARY SEPARATIONS									
11. EFFECTIVE HOUSING REQUIREMENTS		553	1,783	232	2,568	780	2,400	311	3,491
12. HOUSING ASSETS (a + b)		498	1,569	164	2,231	694	1,973	221	2,888
a. UNDER MILITARY CONTROL		245	1,151		1,396	245	1,151		1,396
(1) HOUSED IN EXISTING DOD OWNED/CONTROLLED		245	1,151		1,396	245	1,151		1,396
(2) UNDER CONTRACT/APPROVED									
(3) VACANT									
(4) INACTIVE									
b. PRIVATE HOUSING		253	418	164	835	449	822	221	1,492
(1) ACCEPTABLY HOUSED		253	399	152	804				
(2) ACCEPTABLE VACANT RENTAL			19	12	31				
13. EFFECTIVE HOUSING DEFICIT		55	214	68	337	86	427	90	603
14. PROPOSED PROJECT							118		118

15. REMARKS

ITEM 6 - 13. BASIC DATA WERE EXTRACTED FROM THE HOUSING MARKET ANALYSIS OF JUNE 1992.

ITEM 14. PROPOSED PROJECT
CONSTRUCT: 40 TWO BEDROOM UNITS FOR E4-E6
62 THREE BEDROOM UNITS FOR E4-E6
16 FOUR BEDROOM UNITS FOR E4-E6

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)							2. DATE		
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION BARKSDALE AIR FORCE BASE, LOUISIANA					4. COMMAND AIR COMBAT COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX 0.86			
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			TOTAL
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	
a. As of 30 SEP 92		907	4789	1092		509		1	6		7,304
b. End FY 1998		822	4507	1265		509		1	6		7,110
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (22,382)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)										205,446	
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:										43,340	
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:										8,578	
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)										6,564	
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:										0	
g. Remaining Deficiency:										0	
h. Grand Total:										263,928	
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE			SCOPE		COST (\$000)		DESIGN STATUS		
CODE									START CMPL		
711-142		REPLACE WHERRY HOUSING PHASE 1			118 UN		8,578		TURN KEY		
							TOTAL:		8,578		
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995)											
711-142		REPLACE WHERRY HOUSING PHASE 2			82 UN		6,564		TURN KEY		
							TOTAL:		6,564		
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
10. Mission or Major Functions: Headquarters Eighth Air Force; a flying wing which includes two bombardment squadrons (B-52 aircraft) and one air refueling squadron (KC-135 aircraft); Air Mobility Command operations group (two air refueling squadrons of KC-10 aircraft) and airlift detachment (C-21 aircraft); and an Air Force Reserve fighter wing (A-10 and OA-10 aircraft) and KC-10 associate air refueling group.											

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)				2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION BARKSDALE AIR FORCE BASE, LOUISIANA				4. PROJECT TITLE REPLACE WHERRY HOUSING PHASE 1			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 8.87.41		6. CATEGORY CODE 711-142	7. PROJECT NUMBER AWUB945101		8. PROJECT COST (\$000) 8,578		
9. COST ESTIMATES							
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)		
REPLACE FAMILY HOUSING		UN	118	56,106	6,620		
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					1,124		
SITE PREPARATION		LS			(118)		
ROADS AND PAVING		LS			(507)		
UTILITIES		LS			(95)		
RECREATION		LS			(404)		
SUBTOTAL					7,744		
CONTINGENCY (5%)					387		
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					8,131		
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (5.5%)					447		
TOTAL REQUEST					8,578		
AREA COST FACTOR			.86				
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Construct 59 duplex family housing units with all necessary supporting facilities including: garages, patios, fencing, utilities, air conditioning, appliances, exterior storage, site preparation, roads, parking, sidewalks, basketball court, playground, tot lots, pavilion, fitness trails, recreational vehicle storage, landscaping, and all other necessary support facilities.							
	UNIT TYPE	NET AREA	PROJECT FACTOR	\$/NSF	NO. UNITS	TOTAL COST	
	JNCO 3BR	1200	.83	53	76	4,011,888	
	JNCO 4BR	1350	.83	53	16	950,184	
	SNCO 4BR	1450	.83	53	26	1,658,423	
					118	6,620,495	
11. REQUIREMENT: 602 UN ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 0 <u>PROJECT:</u> Replace Wherry Housing Phase 1. (Current Mission) <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> This project is required to provide modern and efficient replacement housing for military members and their dependents stationed at Barksdale AFB. All units will meet "whole house" standards and provide a living environment comparable to the off-base civilian community. This is the first of multiple phases to provide adequate housing for base personnel. This project represents the first portion of the Housing Community Plan Phase "A". <u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> This initiative replaces Wherry housing units which were declared uninhabitable due to condition and have already been demolished. The result is a shortage of NCO housing on the base. According to the most recent Housing Market Analysis a number of families							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION BARKSDALE AIR FORCE BASE, LOUISIANA		
4. PROJECT TITLE REPLACE WHERRY HOUSING PHASE 1	5. PROJECT NUMBER AWUB945101	
<p>are unsuitably housed. Investigations determined that these families either live in housing below DoD standards, or in housing meeting DoD standards BUT exceeding their maximum housing allowance.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> The base will continue to have a shortage of on-base housing which forces families to live in unsuitable off-base housing which exceeds housing allowances and causes financial hardship.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> This project meets the criteria/scope specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of replacement construction, leasing and status quo operation. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, replacement construction was found to be the most cost efficient over the life of the project.</p>		

MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING JUSTIFICATION		1. DATE OF REPORT (YYMMDD)		2. FISCAL YEAR 1984		REPORT CONTROL SYMBOL DD-A&L (AR) 1718			
3. DOD COMPONENT AIR FORCE	4. REPORTING INSTALLATION			5. DATA AS OF JULY 1991					
		a. NAME BARKSDALE AIR FORCE BASE		b. LOCATION TWO MILES SOUTHEAST OF BOSSIER CITY, LOUISIANA					
ANALYSIS OF REQUIREMENTS AND ASSETS		CURRENT				PROJECTED			
		OFFICER (a)	E9-E4 (b)	E3-E1 (c)	TOTAL (d)	OFFICER (e)	E9-E4 (f)	E3-E1 (g)	TOTAL (h)
6. TOTAL PERSONNEL STRENGTH		1,036	3,670	1,006	5,712	893	3,330	1,328	5,551
7. PERMANENT PARTY PERSONNEL		1,036	3,670	1,006	5,712	893	3,330	1,328	5,551
8. GROSS FAMILY HOUSING REQUIREMENTS		815	2,931	347	4,093	703	2,659	450	3,821
9. TOTAL UNACCEPTABLY HOUSED (a + b + c)		138	1,124	171	1,433				
a. INVOLUNTARILY SEPARATED		4	4	5	13				
b. IN MILITARY HOUSING TO BE DISPOSED/REPLACED			122		122				
c. UNACCEPTABLY HOUSED IN COMMUNITY		134	998	166	1,298				
10. VOLUNTARY SEPARATIONS		8	132	16	156	8	120	22	150
11. EFFECTIVE HOUSING REQUIREMENTS		807	2,799	331	3,937	695	2,539	437	3,671
12. HOUSING ASSETS (a + b)		684	1,836	171	2,691	578	1,433	174	2,185
a. UNDER MILITARY CONTROL		197	316		513	105	324		429
(1) HOUSED IN EXISTING DOD OWNED/CONTROLLED		197	316		513	105	324		429
(2) UNDER CONTRACT/APPROVED									
(3) VACANT									
(4) INACTIVE									
b. PRIVATE HOUSING		487	1,520	171	2,178	473	1,109	174	1,756
(1) ACCEPTABLY HOUSED		476	1,485	166	2,127				
(2) ACCEPTABLE VACANT RENTAL		11	35	5	51				
13. EFFECTIVE HOUSING DEFICIT		123	963	160	1,246	117	1,106	263	1,486
14. PROPOSED PROJECT							118		118
15. REMARKS (SPECIFY ITEM NUMBER).									
ITEM 6-13. BASIC DATA WERE EXTRACTED FROM THE HOUSING MARKET ANALYSIS OF JULY 1991.									
ITEM - 14. PROPOSED PROJECT.									
CONSTRUCT: 76 THREE BEDROOM UNITS FOR E4-E6 16 FOUR BEDROOM UNITS FOR E4-E6 26 FOUR BEDROOM UNITS FOR E7-E9									

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)						2. DATE			
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION HANSCOM AIR FORCE BASE, MASSACHUSETTS				4. COMP AND AIR FORCE MATERIEL COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX 1.23				
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	TOTAL
a. As of 30 SEP 92		928	882	2289							4,099
b. End FY 1998		844	635	2228							3,707
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (1,075)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)										154,874	
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:										18,900	
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:										5,135	
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)										2,500	
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:										0	
g. Remaining Deficiency:										26,200	
h. Grand Total:										207,609	
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE			SCOPE		COST (\$000)		DESIGN STATUS		
CODE									START		CMPL
711-142		REPLACE FAMILY HOUSING			48 UN		5,135		TURN KEY		
							TOTAL:		5,135		
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995)											
711-142		REPLACE FAMILY HOUSING			24 UN		2,500		TURN KEY		
							TOTAL:		2,500		
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
10. Mission or Major Functions: This base hosts the Electronics Systems Division, responsible for management, command, control and direction of all electronics associated research and development with the Air Force Materiel Command; the Air Force Geophysics Laboratory conducting and researching terrestrial, atmospheric, and space environments; the Air Force Computer Acquisition Center; and 2 AFRES aerial port squadrons.											

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION HANSCOM AIR FORCE BASE, MASSACHUSETTS		4. PROJECT TITLE REPLACE FAMILY HOUSING		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 8.87.41	6. CATEGORY CODE 711-142	7. PROJECT NUMBER MXRD930103P1	8. PROJECT COST (\$000) 5,135	

9. COST ESTIMATES				
ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
FY70 APPROPRIATED FAMILY HSG	UN	48	83,641	4,015
SUPPORTING FACILITIES				619
SITE PREPARATION	LS			(103)
ROADS AND PAVING	LS			(129)
UTILITIES	LS			(130)
LANDSCAPING	LS			(45)
DEMOLITION	LS			(212)
SUBTOTAL				4,634
CONTINGENCY (5%)				232
TOTAL CONTRACT COST				4,866
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (5.5%)				268
TOTAL REQUEST				5,135
AREA COST FACTOR		1.23		

10. Description of Proposed Construction: Demolish 48 units of Scott Circle family housing and replace with the construction of 48 new units.

UNIT TYPE	NET AREA	PROJECT FACTOR	\$/NSF	NO. UNITS	TOTAL COST
JNCO 2BR	950	1.25	53	14	881,125
JNCO 4BR	1350	1.25	53	6	536,625
SNCO 3BR	1350	1.25	53	14	1,252,125
SNCO 4BR	1450	1.25	53	14	1,344,875
				48	4,014,750

11. PROJECT: Replace 48 units of housing in Scott Circle. (Current Mission)

REQUIREMENT: Provide units that comply with the Housing Community Plan. Build units to meet USAF current whole house/whole neighborhood standards.

CURRENT SITUATION: The Scott Circle housing area is considered the least desirable housing on Hanscom. There are no private entryways. As many as three families share a common hallway. The units are deficient in required floor space and lack functional floor plans. The immediate living areas around the units are congested. Many units have only one reserved parking space. There is precious little room to live, and privacy is at a premium. The interior water lines are old and in need of replacement. The electrical system and bathrooms are out dated and need upgrading.

IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: Without the replacement of these units, repairs of these units will continue in a costly, piecemeal fashion, with no improvement in the quality of life for the occupants. Military families

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION HANSCOM AIR FORCE BASE, MASSACHUSETTS		
4. PROJECT TITLE REPLACE FAMILY HOUSING	5. PROJECT NUMBER MXRD930103P1	
<p>stationed at Hanscom Air Force Base will be forced to live in unsuitable conditions.</p> <p>ADDITIONAL: An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of new construction, revitalization, leasing and status quo operation. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, replacement construction was found to be the most cost efficient over the life of the project. This project meets the criteria/scope specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide."</p>		

MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING JUSTIFICATION		1. DATE OF REPORT (YYMMDD)			2. FISCAL YEAR 1994		REPORT CONTROL SYMBOL DD-A&L(AF)1718		
3. DOD COMPONENT AIR FORCE		4. REPORTING INSTALLATION a. NAME HANSCOM AIR FORCE BASE				b. LOCATION TWENTY MILES NORTHWEST OF BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS			
5. DATA AS OF DECEMBER 1991		ANALYSIS OF REQUIREMENTS AND ASSETS							
		CURRENT				PROJECTED			
		OFFICER (a)	E9-E4 (b)	E3-E1 (c)	TOTAL (d)	OFFICER (e)	E9-E4 (f)	E3-E1 (g)	TOTAL (h)
6. TOTAL PERSONNEL STRENGTH		1,085	930	183	2,198	1,022	836	126	1,984
7. PERMANENT PARTY PERSONNEL		1,085	930	183	2,198	1,022	836	126	1,984
8. GROSS FAMILY HOUSING REQUIREMENTS		778	655	27	1,460	776	597	19	1,392
9. TOTAL UNACCEPTABLY HOUSED (a + b + c)		134	136	16	286				
a. INVOLUNTARILY SEPARATED		10	10	7	27				
b. IN MILITARY HOUSING TO BE DISPOSED/REPLACED			32		32				
c. UNACCEPTABLE HOUSED IN COMMUNITY		124	94	9	227				
10. VOLUNTARY SEPARATIONS		2	3		5	2	3		5
11. EFFECTIVE HOUSING REQUIREMENTS		776	652	27	1,455	774	594	19	1,387
12. HOUSING ASSETS (a + b)		660	560	19	1,239	658	471	4	1,133
a. UNDER MILITARY CONTROL		386	472		858	402	456		858
(1) HOUSED IN EXISTING DOD OWNED/CONTROLLED		386	472		858	402	456		858
(2) UNDER CONTRACT/APPROVED									
(3) VACANT									
(4) INACTIVE									
b. PRIVATE HOUSING		274	88	19	381	256	15	4	275
(1) ACCEPTABLY HOUSED		266	86	18	370				
(2) ACCEPTABLE VACANT RENTAL		8	2	1	11				
13. EFFECTIVE HOUSING DEFICIT		116	92	8	216	116	123	15	254
14. PROPOSED PROJECT							48		48

15. REMARKS

ITEM 6 - 13. BASIC DATA WERE EXTRACTED FROM THE HOUSING MARKET ANALYSIS OF DECEMBER 1991

ITEM 14. PROPOSED PROJECT
 CONSTRUCT: 14 TWO BEDROOM UNITS FOR E4-E6
 6 FOUR BEDROOM UNITS FOR E4-E6
 14 THREE BEDROOM UNITS FOR E7-E9
 14 FOUR BEDROOM UNITS FOR E7-E9

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)							2. DATE		
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION LACKLAND AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS					4. COMMAND AIR TRAINING COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX 0.88			
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	TOTAL
a. As of 30 SEP 92		1665	4111	2519	82	7086	93	11	372		15,939
b. End FY 1998		1706	4337	2747	298	5052	5	14	756	2	14,917
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (2,705)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)											346,839
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:											0
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:											8,770
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)											0
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:											0
g. Remaining Deficiency:											0
h. Grand Total:											355,609
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE			SCOPE		COST	DESIGN STATUS			
CODE						(\$000)	START	Cmpl			
711-142	REPLACE WHERRY HOUSING			111 UN		8,770	TURN KEY				
						TOTAL:	8,770				
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995) NONE											
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
10. Mission or Major Functions: Air Force Military Training Center which includes Basic Military Training School, Officer Training School, and security police, cryptographic maintenance, recruiting, and social actions courses; Defense Language Institute English Language Center; DoD Military Working Dog Training Agency; and a major Air Force medical center.											

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)				2. DATE		
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION LACKLAND AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS				4. PROJECT TITLE REPLACE WHERRY HOUSING				
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 8.87.41		6. CATEGORY CODE 711-142		7. PROJECT NUMBER MPLS944003		8. PROJECT COST (\$000) 8,770		
9. COST ESTIMATES								
ITEM					U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
REPLACE FAMILY HOUSING					UN	111	56,770	6,301
SUPPORTING FACILITIES								1,616
SITE PREPARATION					LS			(113)
ROADS AND PAVING					LS			(218)
UTILITIES					LS			(450)
LANDSCAPING					LS			(61)
RECREATION					LS			(34)
OTHER (SPECIFY) DEMOLITION					LS			(740)
SUBTOTAL								7,917
CONTINGENCY (5%)								396
TOTAL CONTRACT COST								8,313
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (5.5%)								457
TOTAL REQUEST								8,770
AREA COST FACTOR								.88
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Construct family housing units to include heating, cooling, appliances, garages, patios, and storage. Support facilities include site grading, road systems, sidewalks, curb and gutter, utility distribution system, landscaping, and recreational areas.								
	UNIT TYPE	NET AREA	PROJECT FACTOR	\$/NSF	NO. UNITS	TOTAL COST		
	JNCO 2BR	950	.86	53	2	86,602		
	JNCO 3BR	1200	.86	53	74	4,047,504		
	JNCO 4BR	1350	.86	53	32	1,969,056		
	SNCO 4BR	1450	.86	53	3	198,273		
					111	6,301,435		
11. REQUIREMENT: 111 UN ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 111 UN PROJECT: Replace 111 family housing units. (Current mission) REQUIREMENT: Project is required to provide 111 adequate family housing units meeting wholehouse criteria. In addition, this project will provide much needed neighborhood improvements and reduce housing density. CURRENT SITUATION: These two-story units were built in early 1950 and last renovated in the kitchen, bathroom, and patio areas between 1976 and 1978. These upgrades are now substandard and time-worn. Only routine change of occupancy maintenance and some HVAC repairs have been accomplished. The units are energy inefficient and were constructed with inadequate space. Kitchens are outdated and require complete renovation. Electrical and plumbing systems require replacement to meet current code requirements. These units have served their useful life. IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: Air Force members and their families will								

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION LACKLAND AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS		
4. PROJECT TITLE REPLACE WHERRY HOUSING	5. PROJECT NUMBER MPLS944003	
<p>continue to be housed in unsatisfactory conditions affecting morale, performance, and the retention of quality personnel.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of new construction, revitalization, leasing and status quo operation. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, new construction was found to be the most cost efficient over the life of the project. This project meets the criteria/scope specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide".</p>		

MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING JUSTIFICATION		1. DATE OF REPORT (YYMMDD)		2. FISCAL YEAR 1994		REPORT CONTROL SYMBOL DD-A&L (AR) 1718			
3. DOD COMPONENT AIR FORCE		4. REPORTING INSTALLATION				b. LOCATION			
5. DATA AS OF 31 JANUARY 1990		a. NAME LACKLAND AIR FORCE BASE		THIRTEEN MILES SOUTHWEST OF SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS					
ANALYSIS OF REQUIREMENTS AND ASSETS		CURRENT				PROJECTED			
		OFFICER (a)	E9-E4 (b)	E3-E1 (c)	TOTAL (d)	OFFICER (e)	E9-E4 (f)	E3-E1 (g)	TOTAL (h)
6. TOTAL PERSONNEL STRENGTH		1,763	4,004	2,690	8,457	1,911	3,609	8,119	13,639
7. PERMANENT PARTY PERSONNEL		1,261	3,995	1,094	6,350	1,849	3,609	6,354	11,812
8. GROSS FAMILY HOUSING REQUIREMENTS		830	2,789	282	3,901	1,086	2,266	1,137	4,489
9. TOTAL UNACCEPTABLY HOUSED (a + b + c)		8	126	2	136				
a. INVOLUNTARILY SEPARATED		8	11	2	21				
b. IN MILITARY HOUSING TO BE DISPOSED/REPLACED			115		115				
c. UNACCEPTABLY HOUSED IN COMMUNITY									
10. VOLUNTARY SEPARATIONS		9	88	22	119	12	71	89	172
11. EFFECTIVE HOUSING REQUIREMENTS		821	2,701	260	3,782	1,074	2,195	1,048	4,317
12. HOUSING ASSETS (a + b)		756	2,493	272	3,521	756	2,493	272	3,521
a. UNDER MILITARY CONTROL		104	621		725	104	621		725
(1) HOUSED IN EXISTING DOD OWNED/CONTROLLED		97	606		703	104	621		725
(2) UNDER CONTRACT/APPROVED									
(3) VACANT		7	15		22				
(4) INACTIVE									
b. PRIVATE HOUSING		652	1,872	272	2,796	652	1,872	272	2,796
(1) ACCEPTABLY HOUSED		631	1,801	200	2,632				
(2) ACCEPTABLE VACANT RENTAL		21	71	72	164				
13. EFFECTIVE HOUSING DEFICIT		65	208	-12	261	318	-298	776	796
14. PROPOSED PROJECT							111		111
15. REMARKS (SPECIFY ITEM NUMBER)									
ITEM 6-13. BASIC DATA WERE EXTRACTED FROM THE FAMILY HOUSING SURVEY OF JANUARY 1990									
ITEM 14. PROPOSED PROJECT.									
CONSTRUCT: 2 TWO BEDROOM UNITS FOR E4-E6 74 THREE BEDROOM UNITS FOR E4-E6 32 FOUR BEDROOM UNITS FOR E4-E6 3 FOUR BEDROOM UNIT FOR E7-E9									

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)							2. DATE		
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION FAIRCHILD AIR FORCE BASE, WASHINGTON					4. COMMAND AIR COMBAT COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX 1.00			
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	TOTAL
a. As of 30 SEP 92		562	3570	495	140	372	22				5,161
b. End FY 1998		709	3923	576	140	372	22				5,742
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (6,060)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)										280,299	
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:										34,960	
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:										184	
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)										0	
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:										0	
g. Remaining Deficiency:										0	
h. Grand Total:										315,443	
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE			SCOPE		COST	DESIGN STATUS			
<u>CODE</u>							<u>(\$000)</u>	<u>START</u>	<u>CMPL</u>		
711-142		REPLACE GENERAL OFFICER HOUSING			1 UN		184	TURN KEY			
							TOTAL:	184			
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995) NONE											
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
10. Mission or Major Functions: A bomb wing which includes one B-52 squadron and a combat air rescue detachment with UH-1 helicopters; an Air Mobility Command air refueling group with two KC-135 squadrons; an Air National Guard air refueling wing (KC-135 aircraft); an Air Training Command combat crew training group (survival training school); and an Air Force Space Command satellite control squadron.											

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)				2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION FAIRCHILD AIR FORCE BASE, WASHINGTON				4. PROJECT TITLE REPLACE GENERAL OFFICER HOUSING			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 8.87.41		6. CATEGORY CODE 711-142		7. PROJECT NUMBER GJKZ930038		8. PROJECT COST (\$000) 184	
9. COST ESTIMATES							
ITEM				U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
REPLACE GENERAL OFFICER QUARTERS				UN	1	127,050	127
SUPPORTING FACILITIES							39
SITE PREPARATION				LS			(4)
ROADS AND PAVING				LS			(7)
UTILITIES				LS			(12)
LANDSCAPING				LS			(2)
DEMOLITION & ABESTOS ABATEMENT				LS			(14)
SUBTOTAL							166
CONTINGENCY (5%)							8
TOTAL CONTRACT COST							174
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (5.5%)							10
TOTAL REQUEST							184
AREA COST FACTOR					1.00		
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Replacement of one GOQ unit for the Wing Commander with all necessary support. This project will provide a new building with an attached single car garage, air conditioning, all amenities, and demolition of the existing 1527 square foot GOQ and garage. Supporting facilities include sitework, utility systems, roads, parking, walkways, and landscaping.							
		NET	PROJECT	\$/	NO.		
<u>UNIT TYPE</u>		<u>AREA</u>	<u>FACTOR</u>	<u>NSF</u>	<u>UNITS</u>	<u>TOTAL COST</u>	
GOQ 4BR		2310	1.10	50	1	127,050	
					1	127,050	
11. REQUIREMENT: 1 UN ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 1 UN PROJECT: Replace General Officer Housing. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: Modern and efficient four bedroom housing appropriate for family living and the entertainment responsibilities of the General Officer Installation Commander. CURRENT SITUATION: The existing General Officer Quarters was constructed in 1943 from the plans for a farm house. Rooms are extremely small, and traffic flow from one room to another is very inefficient. Several subsequent additions to the facility, while providing for the needs at that time, have only served to further detract from current needs, modern home design, and home use. For example, what was once an exterior porch, is now an interior bedroom with no windows. The dining room was at one time a kitchen, which was long ago relocated to an addition at the rear of the house. The house was constructed on wood stringers over concrete piles. The stringers and some floor joists are badly rotted and weakened,							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION FAIRCHILD AIR FORCE BASE, WASHINGTON		
4. PROJECT TITLE REPLACE GENERAL OFFICER HOUSING	5. PROJECT NUMBER GJKZ930038	
<p>a condition believed to exist in many areas of the structure, which indicates that the unit is nearing the end of its useful life. In addition, the plumbing and electrical systems are in dire need of replacement and upgrade to modern standards. The unit is energy inefficient and has no central air conditioning system. The numerous additions and current state of structural and infrastructure deterioration have rendered it impractical and cost prohibitive to renovate. The detached garage also has structural problems and similarly is in need of replacement.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> The base will continue to have an unsuitable housing unit to support the Wing Commander and family. The condition of the unit will detract from the representational responsibilities of the Commander. Maintenance and repair costs will continue to increase in the effort keep the house habitable and presentable.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> This project meets the criteria/scope specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of new construction, improvement, leasing and status quo operation. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, new construction was found to be the most cost efficient over the life of the project.</p>		

MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING JUSTIFICATION		1. DATE OF REPORT (YYMMDD)			2. FISCAL YEAR 1994		REPORT CONTROL SYMBOL DD-A&L(AR)1716		
3. DOD COMPONENT AIR FORCE		4. REPORTING INSTALLATION							
5. DATA AS OF 31 JANUARY 1992		a. NAME FAIRCHILD AIR FORCE BASE			b. LOCATION TEN MILES WEST OF SPOKANE, WASHINGTON				
ANALYSIS OF REQUIREMENTS AND ASSETS		CURRENT				PROJECTED			
		OFFICER (a)	E9-E4 (b)	E3-E1 (c)	TOTAL (d)	OFFICER (e)	E9-E4 (f)	E3-E1 (g)	TOTAL (h)
6. TOTAL PERSONNEL STRENGTH		641	28,023	859	4,302	685	2,521	1,267	4,473
7. PERMANENT PARTY PERSONNEL		641	2,802	859	4,302	545	2,487	864	3,996
8. GROSS FAMILY HOUSING REQUIREMENTS		483	2,188	263	2,934	395	1,899	313	2,607
9. TOTAL UNACCEPTABLY HOUSED (a + b + c)		19	86	53	158				
a. INVOLUNTARILY SEPARATED			9	6	15				
b. IN MILITARY HOUSING TO BE DISPOSED/REPLACED									
c. UNACCEPTABLE HOUSED IN COMMUNITY		19	77	47	143				
10. VOLUNTARY SEPARATIONS		7	87	9	103	6	75	11	92
11. EFFECTIVE HOUSING REQUIREMENTS		478	2,101	254	2,831	389	1,824	302	2,515
12. HOUSING ASSETS (a + b)		461	2,024	204	2,689	464	2,028	205	2,695
a. UNDER MILITARY CONTROL		184	1,236	91	1,511	184	1,236	91	1,511
(1) HOUSED IN EXISTING DOD OWNED/CONTROLLED		183	1,232	90	1,505				
(2) UNDER CONTRACT/APPROVED									
(3) VACANT		1	4	1	6				
(4) INACTIVE									
b. PRIVATE HOUSING		277	788	113	1,178	280	790	114	1,184
(1) ACCEPTABLY HOUSED		274	783	111	1,168				
(2) ACCEPTABLE VACANT RENTAL		3	5	2	10				
13. EFFECTIVE HOUSING DEFICIT		15	77	50	142	-75	-202	-97	-180
14. PROPOSED PROJECT						1			1

15. REMARKS

ITEM 6 - 13. BASIC DATA WERE EXTRACTED FROM THE FAMILY HOUSING OF JANUARY 1992.

ITEM 14. PROPOSED PROJECT
PROJECT CONSISTS OF A FOUR BEDROOM GENERAL OFFICER UNIT.

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (computer generated)						2. DATE			
AIR FORCE											
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION					4. COMMAND			5. AREA CONST COST INDEX			
F E WARREN AIR FORCE BASE, WYOMING					AIR COMBAT COMMAND			1.08			
6. PERSONNEL STRENGTH		PERMANENT			STUDENTS			SUPPORTED			TOTAL
		OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	OFF	ENL	CIV	
a. As of 30 SEP 92		559	3030	557							4,146
b. End FY 1998		546	2920	574							4,040
7. INVENTORY DATA (\$000)											
a. Total Acreage: (6,610)											
b. Inventory Total As Of: (30 SEP 92)										214,988	
c. Authorization Not Yet In Inventory:										10,750	
d. Authorization Requested In This Program:										10,572	
e. Authorization Included In Following Program: (FY 1995)										10,621	
f. Planned In Next Four Program Years:										0	
g. Remaining Deficiency:										0	
h. Grand Total:										246,931	
8. PROJECTS REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM: FY 1994											
CATEGORY		PROJECT TITLE			SCOPE		COST (\$000)		DESIGN STATUS		
<u>CODE</u>									<u>START</u>		<u>CMPL</u>
711-142		REPLACE WHERRY HOUSING PHASE 1			104 UN		10,572		TURN KEY		
							TOTAL:		10,572		
9a. Future Projects: Included in the Following Program (FY 1995)											
711-142		REPLACE WHERRY HOUSING PHASE 2			99 UN		10,621		TURN KEY		
							TOTAL:		10,621		
9b. Future Projects: Typical Planned Next Four Years:											
10. Mission or Major Functions: A missile wing consisting of one Peacekeeper and three Minuteman intercontinental ballistic missile squadrons which maintain a continuous alert posture, and a combat air rescue detachment with UH-1 helicopters.											

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)				2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION F E WARREN AIR FORCE BASE, WYOMING			4. PROJECT TITLE REPLACE WHERRY HOUSING PHASE 1				
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 8.87.41		6. CATEGORY CODE 711-142	7. PROJECT NUMBER GHLN941009		8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 10,572		
9. COST ESTIMATES							
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)		
PHASE 1		UN	104	67,416	7,011		
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					2,533		
SITE PREPARATION		LS			(145)		
ROADS AND PAVING		LS			(776)		
UTILITIES		LS			(797)		
LANDSCAPING		LS			(246)		
RECREATION		LS			(65)		
OTHER (DEMOLITION)		LS			(504)		
SUBTOTAL					9,544		
CONTINGENCY (5%)					477		
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					10,021		
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (5.5%)					551		
TOTAL REQUEST					10,572		
AREA COST FACTOR		1.08					
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Construct 104 new family housing units with all necessary supporting facilities. Project includes attached garages, energy conservation features, and appliances. Supporting facilities include site preparation, utilities, pavements, communications, parking, landscaping and recreation areas. Asbestos removal and demolition of 104 existing units.							
	<u>UNIT TYPE</u>	<u>NET AREA</u>	<u>PROJECT FACTOR</u>	<u>\$/NSF</u>	<u>NO. UNITS</u>	<u>TOTAL COST</u>	
	JNCO 3BR	1200	1.06	53	104	7,011,264	
					104	7,011,264	
11. REQUIREMENT: 213 UN ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 213 UN PROJECT: Replace Wherry Housing, Phase 1. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: This project is required to provide modern and efficient housing for military members and dependents stationed at F E Warren AFB. Housing will be improved to provide a safe, comfortable, and appealing living environment comparable to the off-base civilian community. Construction will meet "whole house" standards. This project completes Phase A of the Housing Community Plan. CURRENT SITUATION: The existing 210 Wherry family housing units were constructed over 40 years ago. These facilities are so poor that living in them is strictly voluntary and at reduced BAQ rates. They continue in use because off-base housing is extremely limited in this isolated community. When available, off-base housing is very expensive, and frequently little better than the units being replaced by this project. Few adequate affordable houses are available for Junior NCOs. The							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION F E WARREN AIR FORCE BASE, WYOMING		
4. PROJECT TITLE REPLACE WHERRY HOUSING PHASE 1	5. PROJECT NUMBER GHLN941009	
<p>existing Wherry housing is deficient in size by an average of 300 square feet per unit. The concrete block cavity walls have one inch rigid board insulation, and the flat concrete roof decks have a minimum of rigid board insulation. The concrete floor slabs and block wall exteriors of many units have extensive structural cracks. Housing density is high, and there is little privacy for occupants using backyards. There are no family rooms, porches, carports, garages, or storage rooms. Electrical systems do not meet current national electric codes. There are no Ground Fault Interrupter (GFI) circuits, and the number of outlets is minimal. Furnaces are not installed per current construction codes and the majority require replacing. Bathroom fixtures and finishes are antiquated and in need of total replacement. Kitchens are small with badly deteriorated fixtures and cabinets. Kitchen space is further limited by the presence of washer and dryer equipment. All windows are single glazed, steel frame, and are not energy efficient. The units are drafty, and very difficult to keep warm.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> The inadequate housing units will continue to be occupied because no other housing is available. Local community housing is almost nonexistent, and the situation is deteriorating. Without this and the subsequent phase of this initiative, repairs of these units will continue out of necessity, in a costly, piecemeal fashion, with no improvement in living quality.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> This project meets the criteria/scope specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of new construction, improvement, leasing and status quo operation. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, new construction was found to be the most cost efficient over the life of the project.</p>		

MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING JUSTIFICATION		1. DATE OF REPORT (YYMMDD)		2. FISCAL YEAR 1994		REPORT CONTROL SYMBOL DD-A&L (AR) 1716			
3. DOD COMPONENT AIR FORCE		4. REPORTING INSTALLATION		b. LOCATION					
5. DATA AS OF FEBRUARY 1992		a. NAME FRANCIS E. WARREN AIR FORCE BASE		ONE MILE NORTHWEST OF CHEYENNE, WYOMING					
ANALYSIS OF REQUIREMENTS AND ASSETS		CURRENT				PROJECTED			
		OFFICER (a)	E9-E4 (b)	E3-E1 (c)	TOTAL (d)	OFFICER (e)	E9-E4 (f)	E3-E1 (g)	TOTAL (h)
6. TOTAL PERSONNEL STRENGTH		635	2,346	683	3,664	555	2,337	678	3,570
7. PERMANENT PARTY PERSONNEL		635	2,346	683	3,664	555	2,337	678	3,570
8. GROSS FAMILY HOUSING REQUIREMENTS		438	1,692	204	2,334	383	1,685	202	2,270
9. TOTAL UNACCEPTABLY HOUSED (a + b + c)		77	524	31	632				
a. INVOLUNTARILY SEPARATED		5	9	6	20				
b. IN MILITARY HOUSING TO BE DISPOSED/REPLACED			111		111				
c. UNACCEPTABLY HOUSED IN COMMUNITY		72	404	25	501				
10. VOLUNTARY SEPARATIONS		10	89	5	105	9	89	5	103
11. EFFECTIVE HOUSING REQUIREMENTS		428	1,603	199	2,230	374	1,596	197	2,167
12. HOUSING ASSETS (a + b)		388	1,108	82	1,556	296	1,009	106	1,411
a. UNDER MILITARY CONTROL		114	507		621	114	507		621
(1) HOUSED IN EXISTING DOD OWNED/CONTROLLED		113	508		619	114	507		621
(2) UNDER CONTRACT/APPROVED									
(3) VACANT									
(4) INACTIVE		1	1		2				
b. PRIVATE HOUSING		252	601	82	935	182	502	106	790
(1) ACCEPTABLY HOUSED		242	577	79	898				
(2) ACCEPTABLE VACANT RENTAL		10	24	3	37				
13. EFFECTIVE HOUSING DEFICIT		62	495	117	674	78	587	91	756
14. PROPOSED PROJECT							104		104
15. REMARKS (SPECIFY ITEM NUMBER)									
ITEM 6 - 13. BASIC DATA WERE EXTRACTED FROM THE HOUSING MARKET OF ANALYSIS FEBRUARY 1992.									
ITEM 14. PROPOSED PROJECT.									
CONSTRUCT: 104 THREE BEDROOM UNITS FOR E4-E6									

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)				2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION COMISO AS, ITALY				4. PROJECT TITLE PURCHASE BUILD-LEASE MFH UNITS			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 8.87.41		6. CATEGORY CODE 711-221		7. PROJECT NUMBER EFSA944001		8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 20,200	
9. COST ESTIMATES							
ITEM				U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
PURCHASE BUILD-LEASE MFH UNITS				UN	460	43,913	20,200
SUBTOTAL							20,200
TOTAL CONTRACT COST							20,200
TOTAL REQUEST							20,200
AREA COST FACTOR					1.43		
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Implement the buy out cost option in accordance with the Build-Lease Agreement, Lease No. ITCO-1219A-8512-10TOOA, for 460 MFH units between Si. A. C. Spa and the United States of America at Comiso AS, Italy.							
11. <u>PROJECT</u> : Purchase 460 MFH build-lease units located at Comiso AS, Italy. (Current Mission) <u>REQUIREMENT</u> : Discontinue the annual 10 year lease payment by purchasing 460 MFH units. <u>CURRENT SITUATION</u> : Due to the 10 year build-lease contract which started in 1988 between USAF and the contractor, the Air Force is paying an annual rental fee of \$7.2 million. Since the 10 year lease does not expire until 1998, the buy out cost option of \$20.2 million is more economically feasible than to pay the remaining 4 year lease payment of \$28.8 million. <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED</u> : The Air Force will continue to pay an annual rental fee of \$7.2 million until 1998. If the buy out cost option is not implemented and we continue to pay the annual rental fee, this will result in the Air Force paying an additional \$8.6 million. <u>ADDITIONAL</u> : An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of the buy out cost option and continuing the lease payment. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, the buy out cost option was found to be the most cost efficient.							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)				2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION LITTLE ROCK AIR FORCE BASE, ARKANSAS				4. PROJECT TITLE CONSTRUCT FAMILY HOUSING SERVICE CENTER			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 8.87.41		6. CATEGORY CODE 610-119	7. PROJECT NUMBER NKAK944001R1		8. PROJECT COST (\$000) 980		
9. COST ESTIMATES							
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)		
CONSTRUCT FAMILY HOUSING SERVICE CENTER		LS			572		
FAMILY HOUSING MGT OFFICE		SF	3,568	88	(314)		
MAINTENANCE FACILITY		SF	3,538	73	(258)		
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					313		
SITE IMPROVEMENTS/PAVEMENTS/UTILITIES		LS			(214)		
DEMOLITION		LS			(22)		
COMMUNICATION SUPPORT/FIRE DETECTION		LS			(11)		
SYSTEMS FURNITURE		LS			(40)		
ENERGY CONSERVATION		LS			(26)		
SUBTOTAL					885		
CONTINGENCY (5%)					44		
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					929		
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (5.5%)					51		
TOTAL REQUEST					980		
AREA COST FACTOR		0.79					
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Reinforced concrete foundation & floor slab, masonry walls, sloped roof, all utilities & necessary support. Includes administrative offices, reception area, latrines, storage, & mechanical space. Maintenance shop areas include admin space, locker room, break area, equipment room, latrines, secure equipment parking, service call desk, and supply, bench stock & bulk storage.							
11. PROJECT: Construct a family housing management office and maintenance facility. Includes demolition of existing facility. (Current Mission) <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> An adequate facility for family housing customer service and housing maintenance activities to support 1,535 family housing units. <u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> The family housing management office provides service to over 4,640 families and unaccompanied personnel living off-base. They manage the assignment, termination and maintenance of 1,535 on-base family housing units. The existing family housing operations are located in a deteriorated wood structure built in 1959. The housing maintenance functions are in lean-to type structures with disfunctional existing space consisting of a maze of cubbyholes and rooms. Wood floors and walls are weakened by termites. The maintenance facility is also not centrally located. <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> The family housing management and maintenance facilities will continue to deteriorate, exacerbating maintenance and repair costs. Quality of life for Air Force members and their families will continue to be inadequate.							

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
AIR FORCE						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION				4. PROJECT TITLE		
MALMSTROM AIR FORCE BASE, MONTANA				HOUSING MANAGEMENT OFFICE		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT		6. CATEGORY CODE	7. PROJECT NUMBER		8. PROJECT COST(\$000)	
8.87.41		610-119	NZAS939038		581	
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
HOUSING MANAGEMENT OFFICE		SF	3,000	135	405	
SUPPORTING FACILITIES			1		120	
SITE PREPARATION		LS			(44)	
PLAYGROUND EQUIPMENT/FENCING		LS			(5)	
UTILITIES		LS			(8)	
PARKING/SIDEWALKS		LS			(63)	
SUBTOTAL					525	
CONTINGENCY (5%)					26	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					551	
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (5.5%)					30	
TOTAL REQUEST					581	
AREA COST FACTOR			1.20			
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Reinforced concrete footings, foundation, floor slabs, masonry or reinforced concrete precast wall, standing seam metal roof. Includes parking, sidewalks, landscaping, area lighting, comprehensive interior design, prewired work stations, playground equipment and screen fencing. Includes demolition of existing facility. Air Conditioning: 10 Tons.						
11. <u>PROJECT</u> : Construct a housing management office. (Current Mission) <u>REQUIREMENT</u> : Provide an adequate, functional facility to support the management, inspection and referral for on-base and off-base housing. <u>CURRENT SITUATION</u> : The existing housing management office is in a small overcrowded building without adequate parking, children's play area, and space for private discussion. Current facility configuration is inadequate for space allocation and arrangement, and is inaccessible for the handicapped. The facility is also not centrally located. Serves 4,379 military members. <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED</u> : The housing management staff will not meet basic management office needs and Air Force members and their families who visit the facility cannot be adequately served. <u>ADDITIONAL</u> : This project meets the criteria/scope specified in Part II of This project meets the criteria/scope specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide".						

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)				2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION DYESS AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS				4. PROJECT TITLE CONSTRUCT HOUSING MAINTENANCE FACILITY			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 8.87.41		6. CATEGORY CODE 219-944		7. PROJECT NUMBER FNWZ910048		8. PROJECT COST (\$000) 281	
9. COST ESTIMATES							
ITEM				U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
CONSTRUCT HOUSING MAINTENANCE FACILITY				SF	3,054	65	199
SUPPORTING FACILITIES							54
MISC/DEMOLITION				LS			(54)
SUBTOTAL							253
CONTINGENCY (5%)							13
TOTAL CONTRACT COST							266
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (5.5%)							15
TOTAL REQUEST							281
AREA COST FACTOR				0.92			
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Construct a 3,054 SF facility using a steel frame and metal siding on a concrete foundation and slab on grade floor. This building will include interior walls with gypsum wallboard, electrical wiring, flammable and bulk storage areas, utilities, paved parking, and landscaping. Office area will be furnished with lighting and heating. Includes demolition of existing facility. Air Conditioning: 2 Tons.							
11. REQUIREMENT: 3,054 SF ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 1,280 SF PROJECT: Construct Housing Maintenance Facility. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: Construction of a new Housing Maintenance Facility is the key to meeting the maintenance and repair requirements of the Dyess AFB housing units. Required areas include: an entrance foyer with a self-help counter, an office area, a bench stock area, a shop area, and indoor bulk material storage. Also required is secure exterior bulk and flammable storage. The convenience of collocating housing maintenance and self-help supplies will encourage housing occupants to be more active in caring for their houses. Also, with the construction of a new facility, operational costs will decrease due to energy savings, and collocation of functional areas. CURRENT SITUATION: The Housing Maintenance Facility serves 5,335 military members. Housing maintenance is presently performed by contract in office space located in two 30-year old, temporary wood structures which have exceeded their life expectancy. They are energy and functionally inefficient. As a result, maintenance costs are rapidly increasing. One of the 640 SF buildings is used as office space, and the other is used for storage. These unsightly structures are located in the middle of the housing area and will be demolished as a part of this project. Currently,							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION DYESS AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS		
4. PROJECT TITLE CONSTRUCT HOUSING MAINTENANCE FACILITY	5. PROJECT NUMBER FNWZ910048	
<p>the self-help store is three miles away from the housing area.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> A dedicated cost effective facility is required to meet the needs of Air Force Members and their families, as well as to ensure the efficient operations of the Housing Maintenance Facility. Without this new facility, we seriously jeopardize Housing Maintenance operations.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> This project meets the criteria and scope specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide." An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of new construction, improvement, leasing and status quo operation. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, new construction was found to be the most cost efficient over the life of the project.</p>		

1. COMPONENT		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)		2. DATE	
AIR FORCE					
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION			4. PROJECT TITLE		
LANGLEY AIR FORCE BASE, VIRGINIA			CONSTRUCT HOUSING MANAGEMENT OFFICE		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT	6. CATEGORY CODE	7. PROJECT NUMBER	8. PROJECT COST(\$000)		
8.87.41	610-119	MUHJ940300	452		
9. COST ESTIMATES					
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
CONSTRUCT HOUSING MANAGEMENT OFFICE		SF	4,493	74	332
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					76
UTILITIES		LS			(22)
PAVEMENTS		LS			(17)
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(37)
SUBTOTAL					408
CONTINGENCY (5%)					20
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					428
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (5.5%)					24
TOTAL REQUEST					452
AREA COST FACTOR		0.92			
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Construct a 4,493 square foot masonry building. Work consists of site work, fill and relocation of a drainage ditch, slab on grade, brick veneer exterior wall with concrete block back up, and a sloped asphalt shingled roof. Includes all utilities and necessary support. Air Conditioning: 15 Tons.					
11. REQUIREMENT: 4,493 SF ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 2,200 SF PROJECT: Construct Housing Management Office. (Current Mission) REQUIREMENT: Construction of a new Housing Management Office is key to the efficiency of daily operations of this office, and will ensure that personnel have adequate office space. The Langley Housing Management Office provides a vital service to over 6,000 permanent party families, and manages 1,638 MFH units. The task of Military Family Housing management and off-base housing referral services requires a facility that is conducive to an efficient flow of business. The facility will include open and closed offices, a lobby, a conference room, a breakroom, a storage room, a mechanical room, restrooms, and a children's playground area. CURRENT SITUATION: The existing housing management office does not have adequate space for assigned personnel, and the office layout has many inefficiencies. The office is on the first floor of a 10-story (highrise) housing complex of 90 units. The mechanical system is inadequate and designed to support individual apartments, not a large open area of over 2,200 square feet. Maintenance calls are frequent, causing many interruptions to daily operations. The existing space will be reconfigured and upgraded for a satellite housing office and possibly the Family Support Center.					

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION LANGLEY AIR FORCE BASE, VIRGINIA		
4. PROJECT TITLE CONSTRUCT HOUSING MANAGEMENT OFFICE	5. PROJECT NUMBER MUHJ940300	
<p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> People arriving on the base and seeking housing will be welcomed in a crowded, substandard facility which provides a poor first impression of their new locality and things to come.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> This project meets the criteria/scope specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of new construction, improvement, leasing and status quo operation. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, new construction was found to be the most cost efficient over the life of the project.</p>		

POST ACQUISITION CONSTRUCTION

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING
FY 1994 BUDGET REQUEST

POST ACQUISITION CONSTRUCTION

Program (In Thousands)
FY 1994 Program \$ 53,070
FY 1993 Program \$150,000

Purpose and Scope

The Air Force operates over 129,000 family housing units. The average age of housing units in the Air Force inventory is over 31 years. Over 65,000 of these units now require improvements or renovation to meet contemporary living standards during the next decade. Many of these units require major expenditures to repair or replace deteriorated mechanical, electrical, or structural components, and to provide some of the modern amenities found in comparable community housing. The Post Acquisition Construction Program provides this needed revitalization. Each project also includes a significant amount of concurrent maintenance and repair to maximize the project cost effectiveness (average per project is 68%). An integral aspect of design and whole house revitalization construction projects is energy conservation improvements. Through utilization of improved insulation, high efficiency energy conserving mechanical and electrical systems, we improve efficiency and reduce utility costs. We anticipate generating \$300K in O&M cost avoidance in FY94 and we anticipate continued demonstration of this cost effectiveness.

The Air Force is the acknowledged DoD leader in developing the "whole house" revitalization concept. Whole house is the combination of needed maintenance and repair together with improvements to bring the unit to contemporary standards. In addition, we are looking beyond the house to the entire housing area in our requirements plan. Our "whole neighborhood" concept includes the development of neighborhood vehicular and pedestrian circulation concepts to consider siting, density, landscaping, parking, playgrounds, recreation area and utilities, in addition to the housing unit itself.

Consistent with Authorization and Appropriation Committees' language in FY 90, the Air Force seeks to maintain funding levels in this account to continue revitalizing our aging homes. Consistent with Appropriation Committees' language in FY 85, the Air Force has gathered data on the post acquisition construction projects and included in this submission detail on past projects for these units and any future work programmed within a three year period.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING
FY 1994 BUDGET REQUEST

Program Summary

Authorization is requested for:

- (1) Various improvements to existing public quarters, as described on DD Form 1391.
- (2) Appropriation of \$53,070,000 to fund these projects.

NOTE: Projects within the program are within the statutory limitation of \$50,000 per unit adjusted by area cost factor, except as identified by separate DD Form 1391.

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION VARIOUS AIR FORCE BASES			4. PROJECT TITLE POST ACQUISITION CONSTRUCTION			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 8.87.42	6. CATEGORY CODE 711-000	7. PROJECT NUMBER XXXX9400PAIP	8. PROJECT COST (\$000) 53,070			
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
POST ACQUISITION CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS TO IMPROVE FAMILY HOUSING		UN	588	90,255	53,070 (53,070)	
SUBTOTAL					53,070	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					53,070	
TOTAL REQUEST					53,070	
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Includes all work necessary to revitalize military family housing by providing: air conditioning, where authorized; modern functional layouts; soundproofing; and utility and site improvements. Energy conservation actions include new and additional insulation, storm windows, solar screens, and more efficient heating and cooling systems. (Continued on next pages.)						
11. <u>PROJECT</u> : This request is for appropriation of \$53.070 million to accomplish improvements in family housing units. (Current Mission) <u>REQUIREMENT</u> : To revitalize and improve the livability of older, obsolete family housing units, to conserve energy in these older housing units, and to bring utility systems up to current safety standards. <u>CURRENT SITUATION</u> : The majority of these housing units were constructed since the late 1940's using various design and construction criteria, with different types of material, installed equipment, appliances, livability, and appearance. Many utility and structural systems were designed and constructed during years of plentiful, inexpensive energy resources. Insulation, storm windows, etc., not previously cost effective, are now wise investments. This FY 1994 program will prolong the useful life of many of our older, less modern units by enhancing livability, reducing operation costs and improving safety aspects. <u>ADDITIONAL</u> : These projects meet the criteria/scope specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide" except as noted on the individual DD Form 1391s.						

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE																
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION VARIOUS AIR FORCE BASES																		
4. PROJECT TITLE POST AQUISITION CONSTRUCTION	5. PROJECT NUMBER N/A																	
<p>10. Description of work to be accomplished</p> <table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="426 523 750 555"><u>Location and Project</u></th> <th data-bbox="1138 491 1384 555"><u>Current Working Estimate (\$000)</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="269 587 480 619"><u>UNITED STATES</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="269 651 370 678"><u>ALASKA</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="299 683 654 772">ELMENDORF AFB IMPROVE FAMILY HOUSING FXSB944002R2</td> <td data-bbox="1295 715 1384 742">8,621</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="299 776 1091 1119"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improve 37 duplexes; add attached 2-car garages, arctic entries, and eating areas adjacent to remodeled kitchens. Improve 2 GOQs and convert 5 duplexes to single family residences, add 2-car garages and arctic entries. Work includes utility upgrades, pavements, landscaping, roof repair/replacement, and recreational areas. Convert basement to indoor activity room. (Separate DD Form 1391 attached) - WORK ACCOMPLISHED IN PREVIOUS THREE YEARS: None - WORK PROGRAMMED FOR NEXT THREE YEARS: None </td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="265 1221 381 1249"><u>ARIZONA</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="299 1253 778 1342">DAVIS-MONTHAN AFB IMPROVE SENIOR OFFICER HOUSING FBNV933014</td> <td data-bbox="1323 1285 1384 1312">289</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="299 1347 1091 1757"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improve 3 units by upgrading electrical systems, replace floor coverings, renovate kitchens and bathrooms, add privacy walls and covered patios. Renovate both interior and exterior storage areas and reroof as necessary. Restore one carport to original configuration and add master bedroom and bathroom to one unit. Abate asbestos in roof shingles, floor tile and ceilings. (Separate DD Form 1391 attached) - WORK ACCOMPLISHED IN PREVIOUS THREE YEARS: None. - WORK PROGRAMMED FOR NEXT THREE YEARS: None. </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			<u>Location and Project</u>	<u>Current Working Estimate (\$000)</u>	<u>UNITED STATES</u>		<u>ALASKA</u>		ELMENDORF AFB IMPROVE FAMILY HOUSING FXSB944002R2	8,621	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improve 37 duplexes; add attached 2-car garages, arctic entries, and eating areas adjacent to remodeled kitchens. Improve 2 GOQs and convert 5 duplexes to single family residences, add 2-car garages and arctic entries. Work includes utility upgrades, pavements, landscaping, roof repair/replacement, and recreational areas. Convert basement to indoor activity room. (Separate DD Form 1391 attached) - WORK ACCOMPLISHED IN PREVIOUS THREE YEARS: None - WORK PROGRAMMED FOR NEXT THREE YEARS: None 		<u>ARIZONA</u>		DAVIS-MONTHAN AFB IMPROVE SENIOR OFFICER HOUSING FBNV933014	289	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improve 3 units by upgrading electrical systems, replace floor coverings, renovate kitchens and bathrooms, add privacy walls and covered patios. Renovate both interior and exterior storage areas and reroof as necessary. Restore one carport to original configuration and add master bedroom and bathroom to one unit. Abate asbestos in roof shingles, floor tile and ceilings. (Separate DD Form 1391 attached) - WORK ACCOMPLISHED IN PREVIOUS THREE YEARS: None. - WORK PROGRAMMED FOR NEXT THREE YEARS: None. 	
<u>Location and Project</u>	<u>Current Working Estimate (\$000)</u>																	
<u>UNITED STATES</u>																		
<u>ALASKA</u>																		
ELMENDORF AFB IMPROVE FAMILY HOUSING FXSB944002R2	8,621																	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improve 37 duplexes; add attached 2-car garages, arctic entries, and eating areas adjacent to remodeled kitchens. Improve 2 GOQs and convert 5 duplexes to single family residences, add 2-car garages and arctic entries. Work includes utility upgrades, pavements, landscaping, roof repair/replacement, and recreational areas. Convert basement to indoor activity room. (Separate DD Form 1391 attached) - WORK ACCOMPLISHED IN PREVIOUS THREE YEARS: None - WORK PROGRAMMED FOR NEXT THREE YEARS: None 																		
<u>ARIZONA</u>																		
DAVIS-MONTHAN AFB IMPROVE SENIOR OFFICER HOUSING FBNV933014	289																	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improve 3 units by upgrading electrical systems, replace floor coverings, renovate kitchens and bathrooms, add privacy walls and covered patios. Renovate both interior and exterior storage areas and reroof as necessary. Restore one carport to original configuration and add master bedroom and bathroom to one unit. Abate asbestos in roof shingles, floor tile and ceilings. (Separate DD Form 1391 attached) - WORK ACCOMPLISHED IN PREVIOUS THREE YEARS: None. - WORK PROGRAMMED FOR NEXT THREE YEARS: None. 																		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE												
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION VARIOUS AIR FORCE BASES														
4. PROJECT TITLE POST AQUISITION CONSTRUCTION	5. PROJECT NUMBER N/A													
<p>10. Description of work to be accomplished</p> <table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;"><u>Location and Project</u></th> <th style="text-align: center;"><u>Current Working Estimate (\$000)</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="2"><u>CALIFORNIA</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>EDWARDS AFB WHOLE HOUSE RENOVATION AREA C, PH 7 FSPM944501A7</td> <td style="text-align: right; vertical-align: top;">5,261</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Renovate 76 units by replacing wood trim and fascia, interior walls, exterior wooden storage sheds, and bathtubs. Replace exterior stucco coat. Construct gable roofs to replace existing flat roofs. Replace evaporative cooling units and duct work. Repair deteriorated interior utility systems. Provide an addition to units with a space deficiency greater than 100 SF. (Separate DD Form 1391 attached) - WORK ACCOMPLISHED IN PREVIOUS THREE YEARS: None - WORK PROGRAMMED FOR NEXT THREE YEARS: None </td> </tr> <tr> <td>TRAVIS AFB COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENTS, WHERRY XDAT944008P1</td> <td style="text-align: right; vertical-align: top;">4,078</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Replace sanitary sewage service laterals, provide underground storm drainage, alter/widen streets and build new sidewalks, install street lighting, construct additional parking spaces, privacy screening, and detached carports. Provide community parks and tot lots. Plant trees and install underground drip irrigation. - WORK ACCOMPLISHED IN PREVIOUS THREE YEARS: None - WORK PROGRAMMED FOR NEXT THREE YEARS: None </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			<u>Location and Project</u>	<u>Current Working Estimate (\$000)</u>	<u>CALIFORNIA</u>		EDWARDS AFB WHOLE HOUSE RENOVATION AREA C, PH 7 FSPM944501A7	5,261	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Renovate 76 units by replacing wood trim and fascia, interior walls, exterior wooden storage sheds, and bathtubs. Replace exterior stucco coat. Construct gable roofs to replace existing flat roofs. Replace evaporative cooling units and duct work. Repair deteriorated interior utility systems. Provide an addition to units with a space deficiency greater than 100 SF. (Separate DD Form 1391 attached) - WORK ACCOMPLISHED IN PREVIOUS THREE YEARS: None - WORK PROGRAMMED FOR NEXT THREE YEARS: None 		TRAVIS AFB COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENTS, WHERRY XDAT944008P1	4,078	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Replace sanitary sewage service laterals, provide underground storm drainage, alter/widen streets and build new sidewalks, install street lighting, construct additional parking spaces, privacy screening, and detached carports. Provide community parks and tot lots. Plant trees and install underground drip irrigation. - WORK ACCOMPLISHED IN PREVIOUS THREE YEARS: None - WORK PROGRAMMED FOR NEXT THREE YEARS: None 	
<u>Location and Project</u>	<u>Current Working Estimate (\$000)</u>													
<u>CALIFORNIA</u>														
EDWARDS AFB WHOLE HOUSE RENOVATION AREA C, PH 7 FSPM944501A7	5,261													
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Renovate 76 units by replacing wood trim and fascia, interior walls, exterior wooden storage sheds, and bathtubs. Replace exterior stucco coat. Construct gable roofs to replace existing flat roofs. Replace evaporative cooling units and duct work. Repair deteriorated interior utility systems. Provide an addition to units with a space deficiency greater than 100 SF. (Separate DD Form 1391 attached) - WORK ACCOMPLISHED IN PREVIOUS THREE YEARS: None - WORK PROGRAMMED FOR NEXT THREE YEARS: None 														
TRAVIS AFB COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENTS, WHERRY XDAT944008P1	4,078													
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Replace sanitary sewage service laterals, provide underground storm drainage, alter/widen streets and build new sidewalks, install street lighting, construct additional parking spaces, privacy screening, and detached carports. Provide community parks and tot lots. Plant trees and install underground drip irrigation. - WORK ACCOMPLISHED IN PREVIOUS THREE YEARS: None - WORK PROGRAMMED FOR NEXT THREE YEARS: None 														

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE														
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION VARIOUS AIR FORCE BASES																
4. PROJECT TITLE POST AQUISITION CONSTRUCTION	5. PROJECT NUMBER N/A															
<p>10. Description of work to be accomplished</p> <table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="431 512 750 537"><u>Location and Project</u></th> <th data-bbox="1153 478 1389 537"><u>Current Working Estimate (\$000)</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="270 575 398 600"><u>COLORADO</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="303 606 794 695"> USAF ACADEMY IMPROVE CAPEHART FAMILY HOUSING XQPZ940030 </td> <td data-bbox="1314 632 1389 657">4,685</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="303 701 1100 1289"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improve 75 Capehart units. Renovate kitchens and bathrooms and add family rooms, bathrooms, privacy fencing, garages, & trash enclosures. Relocate washers & dryers to main level & patios next to the family room/kitchen. Functional layouts will be modified and net square feet increased as required. Repair interior and exterior features and landscape as required. Mitigate radon. (Separate DD Form 1391 attached) - WORK ACCOMPLISHED IN PREVIOUS THREE YEARS: Includes some radon mitigation (average cost, \$2,700/unit), some minor roof repairs (\$1,400/unit average), and basement leak repairs (\$4,500/unit average). - WORK PROGRAMMED FOR NEXT THREE YEARS: No work is programmed for the next three years in these units, although some roof repairs may be identified at a later date. </td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="270 1394 381 1419"><u>FLORIDA</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="303 1425 844 1514"> ELGIN AUX FIELD 9 (HURLBURT FIELD) MFH COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENTS FTEV944001 </td> <td data-bbox="1344 1455 1389 1480">658</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="303 1520 1100 1730"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide and install prefabricated wood/composite wood and steel playground equipment, retaining curbs, sidewalks, sitting areas, open lawns, and landscape plantings for shade and screening. Includes utilities and all necessary support. - WORK ACCOMPLISHED IN PREVIOUS THREE YEARS: None - WORK PROGRAMMED FOR NEXT THREE YEARS: None </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			<u>Location and Project</u>	<u>Current Working Estimate (\$000)</u>	<u>COLORADO</u>		USAF ACADEMY IMPROVE CAPEHART FAMILY HOUSING XQPZ940030	4,685	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improve 75 Capehart units. Renovate kitchens and bathrooms and add family rooms, bathrooms, privacy fencing, garages, & trash enclosures. Relocate washers & dryers to main level & patios next to the family room/kitchen. Functional layouts will be modified and net square feet increased as required. Repair interior and exterior features and landscape as required. Mitigate radon. (Separate DD Form 1391 attached) - WORK ACCOMPLISHED IN PREVIOUS THREE YEARS: Includes some radon mitigation (average cost, \$2,700/unit), some minor roof repairs (\$1,400/unit average), and basement leak repairs (\$4,500/unit average). - WORK PROGRAMMED FOR NEXT THREE YEARS: No work is programmed for the next three years in these units, although some roof repairs may be identified at a later date. 		<u>FLORIDA</u>		ELGIN AUX FIELD 9 (HURLBURT FIELD) MFH COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENTS FTEV944001	658	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide and install prefabricated wood/composite wood and steel playground equipment, retaining curbs, sidewalks, sitting areas, open lawns, and landscape plantings for shade and screening. Includes utilities and all necessary support. - WORK ACCOMPLISHED IN PREVIOUS THREE YEARS: None - WORK PROGRAMMED FOR NEXT THREE YEARS: None 	
<u>Location and Project</u>	<u>Current Working Estimate (\$000)</u>															
<u>COLORADO</u>																
USAF ACADEMY IMPROVE CAPEHART FAMILY HOUSING XQPZ940030	4,685															
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improve 75 Capehart units. Renovate kitchens and bathrooms and add family rooms, bathrooms, privacy fencing, garages, & trash enclosures. Relocate washers & dryers to main level & patios next to the family room/kitchen. Functional layouts will be modified and net square feet increased as required. Repair interior and exterior features and landscape as required. Mitigate radon. (Separate DD Form 1391 attached) - WORK ACCOMPLISHED IN PREVIOUS THREE YEARS: Includes some radon mitigation (average cost, \$2,700/unit), some minor roof repairs (\$1,400/unit average), and basement leak repairs (\$4,500/unit average). - WORK PROGRAMMED FOR NEXT THREE YEARS: No work is programmed for the next three years in these units, although some roof repairs may be identified at a later date. 																
<u>FLORIDA</u>																
ELGIN AUX FIELD 9 (HURLBURT FIELD) MFH COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENTS FTEV944001	658															
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide and install prefabricated wood/composite wood and steel playground equipment, retaining curbs, sidewalks, sitting areas, open lawns, and landscape plantings for shade and screening. Includes utilities and all necessary support. - WORK ACCOMPLISHED IN PREVIOUS THREE YEARS: None - WORK PROGRAMMED FOR NEXT THREE YEARS: None 																

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE														
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION VARIOUS AIR FORCE BASES																
4. PROJECT TITLE POST AQUISITION CONSTRUCTION	5. PROJECT NUMBER N/A															
<p>10. Description of work to be accomplished</p> <table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="426 523 745 549"><u>Location and Project</u></th> <th data-bbox="1136 491 1372 549"><u>Current Working Estimate (\$000)</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="274 587 351 612"><u>IDAHO</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="302 619 650 704">MOUNTAIN HOME AFB IMPROVE FAMILY HOUSING QYZH945003</td> <td data-bbox="1295 651 1372 676">4,411</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="302 715 1087 1023"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improve 60 family housing units by renovating kitchens and bathrooms, reconfiguring floor plans, improving interior and exterior finishes, upgrading mechanical and electrical systems, and remodeling garages or carports. Includes asbestos removal. (Separate DD Form 1391 attached) - WORK ACCOMPLISHED IN PREVIOUS THREE YEARS: None. - WORK PROGRAMMED FOR NEXT THREE YEARS: None. </td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="274 1123 393 1149"><u>ILLINOIS</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="302 1155 645 1240">SCOTT AFB IMPROVE FAMILY HOUSING VDYD924000</td> <td data-bbox="1295 1187 1372 1212">7,705</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="302 1251 1087 1559"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improve 107 appropriated units. Upgrade kitchen/bathrooms, remodel interior, replace windows, install vinylsiding, upgrade/replace mechanical and electrical systems, reconfigure floor plans, add patios, privacy screens, and landscaping. Remove asbestos. (Separate DD Form 1391 attached) - WORK ACCOMPLISHED IN PREVIOUS THREE YEARS: FY91 Expand parking, add storage \$117K - WORK PROGRAMMED FOR NEXT THREE YEARS: None </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			<u>Location and Project</u>	<u>Current Working Estimate (\$000)</u>	<u>IDAHO</u>		MOUNTAIN HOME AFB IMPROVE FAMILY HOUSING QYZH945003	4,411	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improve 60 family housing units by renovating kitchens and bathrooms, reconfiguring floor plans, improving interior and exterior finishes, upgrading mechanical and electrical systems, and remodeling garages or carports. Includes asbestos removal. (Separate DD Form 1391 attached) - WORK ACCOMPLISHED IN PREVIOUS THREE YEARS: None. - WORK PROGRAMMED FOR NEXT THREE YEARS: None. 		<u>ILLINOIS</u>		SCOTT AFB IMPROVE FAMILY HOUSING VDYD924000	7,705	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improve 107 appropriated units. Upgrade kitchen/bathrooms, remodel interior, replace windows, install vinylsiding, upgrade/replace mechanical and electrical systems, reconfigure floor plans, add patios, privacy screens, and landscaping. Remove asbestos. (Separate DD Form 1391 attached) - WORK ACCOMPLISHED IN PREVIOUS THREE YEARS: FY91 Expand parking, add storage \$117K - WORK PROGRAMMED FOR NEXT THREE YEARS: None 	
<u>Location and Project</u>	<u>Current Working Estimate (\$000)</u>															
<u>IDAHO</u>																
MOUNTAIN HOME AFB IMPROVE FAMILY HOUSING QYZH945003	4,411															
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improve 60 family housing units by renovating kitchens and bathrooms, reconfiguring floor plans, improving interior and exterior finishes, upgrading mechanical and electrical systems, and remodeling garages or carports. Includes asbestos removal. (Separate DD Form 1391 attached) - WORK ACCOMPLISHED IN PREVIOUS THREE YEARS: None. - WORK PROGRAMMED FOR NEXT THREE YEARS: None. 																
<u>ILLINOIS</u>																
SCOTT AFB IMPROVE FAMILY HOUSING VDYD924000	7,705															
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improve 107 appropriated units. Upgrade kitchen/bathrooms, remodel interior, replace windows, install vinylsiding, upgrade/replace mechanical and electrical systems, reconfigure floor plans, add patios, privacy screens, and landscaping. Remove asbestos. (Separate DD Form 1391 attached) - WORK ACCOMPLISHED IN PREVIOUS THREE YEARS: FY91 Expand parking, add storage \$117K - WORK PROGRAMMED FOR NEXT THREE YEARS: None 																

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE														
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION VARIOUS AIR FORCE BASES																
4. PROJECT TITLE POST AQUISITION CONSTRUCTION	5. PROJECT NUMBER N/A															
<p>10. Description of work to be accomplished</p> <table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;"><u>Location and Project</u></th> <th style="text-align: right;"><u>Current Working Estimate (\$000)</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="2"><u>OHIO</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>WRIGHT-PATTERSON AFB IMPROVE FAMILY HOUSING ZHTV820016P7</td> <td style="text-align: right; vertical-align: top;">3,822</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improve 70 Wherry units and 4 SOQs. Work includes new plumbing, electrical, HVAC systems, refinishing interior surfaces, and reconfiguration of functional layout. Improve exterior by installing rear entry steel doors, provide patios, privacy fences, storage sheds and correct drainage. Construct additions to the SOQs to add authorized square footage. Provide radon mitigation. (Separate DD Form 1391 attached) - WORK ACCOMPLISHED IN PREVIOUS THREE YEARS: None - WORK PROGRAMMED FOR NEXT THREE YEARS: None </td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2"><u>SOUTH CAROLINA</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>CHARLESTON AFB COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENTS PH B DKFX954033</td> <td style="text-align: right; vertical-align: top;">3,500</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improve housing neighborhood area. Upgrade lighting systems, regrade low-lying areas and install storm drainage, install underground drip irrigation system and construct community parks with open space and recreational facilities. - WORK ACCOMPLISHED IN PREVIOUS THREE YEARS: None. - WORK PROGRAMMED FOR NEXT THREE YEARS: None. </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			<u>Location and Project</u>	<u>Current Working Estimate (\$000)</u>	<u>OHIO</u>		WRIGHT-PATTERSON AFB IMPROVE FAMILY HOUSING ZHTV820016P7	3,822	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improve 70 Wherry units and 4 SOQs. Work includes new plumbing, electrical, HVAC systems, refinishing interior surfaces, and reconfiguration of functional layout. Improve exterior by installing rear entry steel doors, provide patios, privacy fences, storage sheds and correct drainage. Construct additions to the SOQs to add authorized square footage. Provide radon mitigation. (Separate DD Form 1391 attached) - WORK ACCOMPLISHED IN PREVIOUS THREE YEARS: None - WORK PROGRAMMED FOR NEXT THREE YEARS: None 		<u>SOUTH CAROLINA</u>		CHARLESTON AFB COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENTS PH B DKFX954033	3,500	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improve housing neighborhood area. Upgrade lighting systems, regrade low-lying areas and install storm drainage, install underground drip irrigation system and construct community parks with open space and recreational facilities. - WORK ACCOMPLISHED IN PREVIOUS THREE YEARS: None. - WORK PROGRAMMED FOR NEXT THREE YEARS: None. 	
<u>Location and Project</u>	<u>Current Working Estimate (\$000)</u>															
<u>OHIO</u>																
WRIGHT-PATTERSON AFB IMPROVE FAMILY HOUSING ZHTV820016P7	3,822															
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improve 70 Wherry units and 4 SOQs. Work includes new plumbing, electrical, HVAC systems, refinishing interior surfaces, and reconfiguration of functional layout. Improve exterior by installing rear entry steel doors, provide patios, privacy fences, storage sheds and correct drainage. Construct additions to the SOQs to add authorized square footage. Provide radon mitigation. (Separate DD Form 1391 attached) - WORK ACCOMPLISHED IN PREVIOUS THREE YEARS: None - WORK PROGRAMMED FOR NEXT THREE YEARS: None 																
<u>SOUTH CAROLINA</u>																
CHARLESTON AFB COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENTS PH B DKFX954033	3,500															
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improve housing neighborhood area. Upgrade lighting systems, regrade low-lying areas and install storm drainage, install underground drip irrigation system and construct community parks with open space and recreational facilities. - WORK ACCOMPLISHED IN PREVIOUS THREE YEARS: None. - WORK PROGRAMMED FOR NEXT THREE YEARS: None. 																

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE												
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION VARIOUS AIR FORCE BASES														
4. PROJECT TITLE POST AQUISITION CONSTRUCTION	5. PROJECT NUMBER N/A													
<p>10. Description of work to be accomplished</p> <table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="419 512 740 541"><u>Location and Project</u></th> <th data-bbox="1136 478 1377 541"><u>Current Working Estimate (\$000)</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="261 575 426 604"><u>WASHINGTON</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="294 606 645 695">MCCHORD AFB IMPROVE FAMILY HOUSING PQWY924004</td> <td data-bbox="1298 634 1377 663">5,731</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="294 699 1058 915">- Improve 70 Capehart units. Enlarge entrance, add family room, reconfigure kitchen, upgrade mechanical and electrical systems. Replace windows, doors, flooring, plumbing, exterior siding, and patios. Add showers and 3/4 baths and expand parking. Provide neighborhood improvement. (Separate DD Form 1391 attached)</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="294 949 1087 1041">- WORK ACCOMPLISHED IN PREVIOUS THREE YEARS: FY91 Repair roofs \$180K; FY91 Repair storage sheds/siding \$17K</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="294 1045 1009 1075">- WORK PROGRAMMED FOR NEXT THREE YEARS: None</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			<u>Location and Project</u>	<u>Current Working Estimate (\$000)</u>	<u>WASHINGTON</u>		MCCHORD AFB IMPROVE FAMILY HOUSING PQWY924004	5,731	- Improve 70 Capehart units. Enlarge entrance, add family room, reconfigure kitchen, upgrade mechanical and electrical systems. Replace windows, doors, flooring, plumbing, exterior siding, and patios. Add showers and 3/4 baths and expand parking. Provide neighborhood improvement. (Separate DD Form 1391 attached)		- WORK ACCOMPLISHED IN PREVIOUS THREE YEARS: FY91 Repair roofs \$180K; FY91 Repair storage sheds/siding \$17K		- WORK PROGRAMMED FOR NEXT THREE YEARS: None	
<u>Location and Project</u>	<u>Current Working Estimate (\$000)</u>													
<u>WASHINGTON</u>														
MCCHORD AFB IMPROVE FAMILY HOUSING PQWY924004	5,731													
- Improve 70 Capehart units. Enlarge entrance, add family room, reconfigure kitchen, upgrade mechanical and electrical systems. Replace windows, doors, flooring, plumbing, exterior siding, and patios. Add showers and 3/4 baths and expand parking. Provide neighborhood improvement. (Separate DD Form 1391 attached)														
- WORK ACCOMPLISHED IN PREVIOUS THREE YEARS: FY91 Repair roofs \$180K; FY91 Repair storage sheds/siding \$17K														
- WORK PROGRAMMED FOR NEXT THREE YEARS: None														

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE												
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION VARIOUS AIR FORCE BASES														
4. PROJECT TITLE POST AQUISITION CONSTRUCTION	5. PROJECT NUMBER N/A													
<p>10. Description of work to be accomplished</p> <table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;"><u>Location and Project</u></th> <th style="text-align: center;"><u>Current Working Estimate (\$000)</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="2"><u>OVERSEAS</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2"><u>AUSTRALIA</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td> WOOMERA AS IMPROVE FAMILY HOUSING, PH III ZGTT944002 - Improve 6 family housing units. Renovate kitchens and baths; replace HVAC, electrical wiring and fixtures, plumbing and fixtures, doors and windows, ceilings, and weatherize with insulation; repaint interior; landscape yards and install sprinkler system. Includes all utilities and necessary support. (Separate DD Form 1391 attached) - WORK ACCOMPLISHED IN PREVIOUS THREE YEARS: None - WORK PROGRAMMED FOR NEXT THREE YEARS: None </td> <td style="text-align: center; vertical-align: top;">430</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2"><u>GUAM</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td> ANDERSEN AFB IMPROVE FAMILY HOUSING AJJY944404R2 - Improve 36 family housing units. Work includes enlarging the master bedroom, modernizing kitchen and bathrooms, repairing entire plumbing and electrical systems; construction of outside storage, installation of package A/C system, removal of asbestos. Whole neighborhood renovation includes construction (i.e. bus shelters, playgrounds, sidewalks, pavements and utilities). - WORK ACCOMPLISHED IN PREVIOUS THREE YEARS: None - WORK PROGRAMMED FOR NEXT THREE YEARS: None </td> <td style="text-align: center; vertical-align: top;">3,879</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			<u>Location and Project</u>	<u>Current Working Estimate (\$000)</u>	<u>OVERSEAS</u>		<u>AUSTRALIA</u>		WOOMERA AS IMPROVE FAMILY HOUSING, PH III ZGTT944002 - Improve 6 family housing units. Renovate kitchens and baths; replace HVAC, electrical wiring and fixtures, plumbing and fixtures, doors and windows, ceilings, and weatherize with insulation; repaint interior; landscape yards and install sprinkler system. Includes all utilities and necessary support. (Separate DD Form 1391 attached) - WORK ACCOMPLISHED IN PREVIOUS THREE YEARS: None - WORK PROGRAMMED FOR NEXT THREE YEARS: None	430	<u>GUAM</u>		ANDERSEN AFB IMPROVE FAMILY HOUSING AJJY944404R2 - Improve 36 family housing units. Work includes enlarging the master bedroom, modernizing kitchen and bathrooms, repairing entire plumbing and electrical systems; construction of outside storage, installation of package A/C system, removal of asbestos. Whole neighborhood renovation includes construction (i.e. bus shelters, playgrounds, sidewalks, pavements and utilities). - WORK ACCOMPLISHED IN PREVIOUS THREE YEARS: None - WORK PROGRAMMED FOR NEXT THREE YEARS: None	3,879
<u>Location and Project</u>	<u>Current Working Estimate (\$000)</u>													
<u>OVERSEAS</u>														
<u>AUSTRALIA</u>														
WOOMERA AS IMPROVE FAMILY HOUSING, PH III ZGTT944002 - Improve 6 family housing units. Renovate kitchens and baths; replace HVAC, electrical wiring and fixtures, plumbing and fixtures, doors and windows, ceilings, and weatherize with insulation; repaint interior; landscape yards and install sprinkler system. Includes all utilities and necessary support. (Separate DD Form 1391 attached) - WORK ACCOMPLISHED IN PREVIOUS THREE YEARS: None - WORK PROGRAMMED FOR NEXT THREE YEARS: None	430													
<u>GUAM</u>														
ANDERSEN AFB IMPROVE FAMILY HOUSING AJJY944404R2 - Improve 36 family housing units. Work includes enlarging the master bedroom, modernizing kitchen and bathrooms, repairing entire plumbing and electrical systems; construction of outside storage, installation of package A/C system, removal of asbestos. Whole neighborhood renovation includes construction (i.e. bus shelters, playgrounds, sidewalks, pavements and utilities). - WORK ACCOMPLISHED IN PREVIOUS THREE YEARS: None - WORK PROGRAMMED FOR NEXT THREE YEARS: None	3,879													

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING
FY 1994 BUDGET REQUEST

POST ACQUISITION CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS (over \$50,000 per unit)

A separate DD Form 1391 follows for each Post Acquisition Construction project which is over \$50,000 per unit (multiplied by the Area Cost Factor).

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ELMENDORF AIR FORCE BASE, ALASKA			4. PROJECT TITLE IMPROVE FAMILY HOUSING			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 8.87.42		6. CATEGORY CODE 711-143	7. PROJECT NUMBER FXSB944002R2	8. PROJECT COST (\$000) 8,621		
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
IMPROVE FAMILY HOUSING		UN	81	87,542	7,091	
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					880	
UTILITIES		LS			(124)	
LANDSCAPING AND PLAYGROUNDS		LS			(109)	
PAVEMENTS/SIDEWALKS/BIKE PATHS		LS			(446)	
ASBESTOS ABATEMENT		UN	90	2,000	(180)	
DEMOLITION		UN	7	3,000	(21)	
SUBTOTAL					7,971	
CONTINGENCY (5%)					399	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					8,370	
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (3%)					251	
TOTAL REQUEST					8,621	
MOST EXPENSIVE UNIT				\$148,930		
AREA COST FACTOR				1.69		
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Improve 37 duplexes; add attached 2-car garages, arctic entries, and eating areas adjacent to remodeled kitchens. Improve 2 GOQs and convert 5 duplexes to single family residences, add 2-car garages and arctic entries. Work includes utility upgrades, pavements, landscaping, roof repair/replacement, and recreational areas. Convert basement to indoor activity room.						
11. <u>PROJECT</u> : Improve 81 family housing units (including two general officer quarters). <u>REQUIREMENT</u> : These units must be upgraded to provide AF officers with quarters which meet AF standards for size, safety, maintainability, appearance and comfort. Garages and arctic entries are necessary for protection against the harsh Alaskan environment. Five buildings (10 units) will be converted to 4 bedroom single family units for senior officers. Private yards, landscaping along the new garage side of the quarters, recreational facilities, and underground placement of electric services are needed to complete development of the neighborhood. <u>CURRENT SITUATION</u> : These housing units were constructed in 1942. The units were built extremely close to narrow through streets, resulting in inadequate space for safe parking. Open vehicular parking for both occupants and guests has been provided in the rear of the units forcing primary entry to these quarters through the kitchen. Besides being the primary entry area, the kitchen lacks sufficient counter and storage space, and an eating area. The dining and living rooms are spacious, but the first floor lacks a powder room. Interior finishes, electric service and plumbing fixtures require upgrading. Exterior utilities are generally adequate. The neighborhood has been upgraded to natural gas service and water/sewer service is reliable. Electric service is overhead.						

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION ELMENDORF AIR FORCE BASE, ALASKA		
4. PROJECT TITLE IMPROVE FAMILY HOUSING	5. PROJECT NUMBER FXSB944002R2	
<p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Air Force members and their families will continue to be housed in unsatisfactory quarters with detrimental effects on morale and retention of personnel. These quarters will not provide vehicle protection which is the standard in this environment for all ranks.</p> <p><u>WORK ACCOMPLISHED IN PREVIOUS THREE YEARS:</u> None</p> <p><u>WORK PROGRAMMED FOR NEXT THREE YEARS:</u> None</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> Average estimated replacement cost by the economic analysis for an individual unit is \$275,167. The average renovation/improvement cost including asbestos abatement is 31% of replacement cost. This project meets the criteria/scope specified in Part II of Military Handbook, "Facilities Planning and Design Guide." An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of new construction, revitalization and status quo operation. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, revitalization was found to be the most cost efficient over the life of the project.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION DAVIS-MONTHAN AIR FORCE BASE, ARIZONA		4. PROJECT TITLE IMPROVE SENIOR OFFICER HOUSING		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 8.87.42	6. CATEGORY CODE 711-143	7. PROJECT NUMBER FBNV933014	8. PROJECT COST (\$000) 289	
9. COST ESTIMATES				
ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
IMPROVE SENIOR OFFICER HOUSING	EA	3	85,000	255
SUPPORTING FACILITIES				13
PRIVACY FENCING	LS			(11)
DRIVEWAYS	LS			(2)
SUBTOTAL				268
CONTINGENCY (5%)				13
TOTAL CONTRACT COST				281
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (3%)				8
TOTAL REQUEST				289
MOST EXPENSIVE UNIT			\$117,280	
AREA COST FACTOR			0.90	
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Improve 3 units by upgrading electrical systems, replace floor coverings, renovate kitchens and bathrooms, add privacy walls and covered patios. Renovate both interior and exterior storage areas and reroof as necessary. Restore one carport to original configuration and add master bedroom and bathroom to one unit. Abate asbestos in roof shingles, floor tile and ceilings.				
11. REQUIREMENT: 3 UN ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 3 UN PROJECT: Improve Senior Officer Housing. REQUIREMENT: Provide modern and efficient 4 bedroom housing appropriate for family living and the representational responsibilities of the installation senior command staff. CURRENT SITUATION: The existing housing units were built in 1952 and 1957, and do not meet current standards for senior officer housing. These units have never received major improvements and are beginning to show the wear and tear of years of continuous use. Layout, utilities, cabinets and fixtures are all dated, substandard, and in need of replacement. One unit has inadequate space for the authorized grade. All have outdated electrical systems which no longer meet national electrical codes. Insulation is substandard and results in high heat and air conditioning costs. Interior and exterior storage is inadequate. Wholehouse renovation is required to bring the senior officer housing up to current standards of living. This project corresponds with the Senior Officer Quarters project identified in the Housing Community Plan. IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: The base will continue to have unsuitable housing to support senior leadership. As the housing continues to age without upgrade, accelerated deterioration of electrical, plumbing, and other systems can be expected, with increasing and unacceptable maintenance and				

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION DAVIS-MONTHAN AIR FORCE BASE, ARIZONA		
4. PROJECT TITLE IMPROVE SENIOR OFFICER HOUSING	5. PROJECT NUMBER FBNV933014	
<p>repair costs to the base. Accelerated deterioration could result in the necessity to replace the units at a greater cost rather than upgrade in the future.</p> <p><u>WORK ACCOMPLISHED IN PREVIOUS THREE YEARS:</u> None.</p> <p><u>WORK PROGRAMMED FOR NEXT THREE YEARS:</u> None.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> This project meets the criteria/scope specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of new construction, improvement, leasing and status quo operation. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, improvement was found to be the most cost efficient over the life of the project.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION EDWARDS AIR FORCE BASE, CALIFORNIA			4. PROJECT TITLE WHOLE HOUSE RENOVATION AREA C, PH 7			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 8.87.42	6. CATEGORY CODE 711-121	7. PROJECT NUMBER FSPM944501A7	8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 5,261			
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
WHOLE HOUSE RENOVATION AREA C, PH 7		UN	76	62,740	4,768	
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					97	
LANDSCAPING		LS			(97)	
SUBTOTAL					4,865	
CONTINGENCY (5%)					243	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					5,108	
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (3%)					153	
TOTAL REQUEST					5,261	
MOST EXPENSIVE UNIT				\$98,000		
AREA COST FACTOR				1.38		
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Renovate 76 units by replacing wood trim and fascia, interior walls, exterior wooden storage sheds, and bathtubs. Replace exterior stucco coat. Construct gable roofs to replace existing flat roofs. Replace evaporative cooling units and duct work. Repair deteriorated interior utility systems. Provide an addition to units with a space deficiency greater than 100 SF.						
11. <u>PROJECT</u> : Renovate Wherry family housing units, phase 7. <u>REQUIREMENT</u> : Provide quality of life improvements to existing housing units in order to meet "whole house" standards. Provide adequate and modern housing units comparable to those available in the local community. Provide efficient and reliable interior utility systems. <u>CURRENT SITUATION</u> : Due to the harsh desert sun and severe temperature extremes at Edwards AFB, the exterior stucco and wood trim have deteriorated to the point where replacement of the trim and stucco is necessary. The existing flat roofs are leaking severely thus requiring high maintenance. Gable roofs are more energy-efficient, require less maintenance, and are more aesthetically pleasing than flat roofs. The existing evaporative cooling units are old and in need of replacement. Continued operation of these cooling systems is wasting valuable energy dollars. The interior utility systems are experiencing a high failure rate. Simply, the physical condition, general appearance, and quality of life in Area C requires improvement. This is the first "whole house" renovation for these housing units since construction in 1953. <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED</u> : These homes will continue to deteriorate, and maintenance will become unmanageable. The exterior appearance of the residences will continue to be an eyesore, lacking in quality and aesthetics. Without the new roofs, water intrusion will get worse and						

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION EDWARDS AIR FORCE BASE, CALIFORNIA		
4. PROJECT TITLE WHOLE HOUSE RENOVATION AREA C, PH 7	5. PROJECT NUMBER FSPM944501A7	
<p>energy will be wasted. The utility systems will become irreparable. Families will be forced to occupy substandard, inadequate housing.</p> <p><u>WORK ACCOMPLISHED IN PREVIOUS THREE YEARS:</u> None</p> <p><u>WORK PROGRAMMED FOR NEXT THREE YEARS:</u> None</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of new construction, improvement, leasing and status quo operation. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, improvement was found to be the most cost efficient over the life of the project.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION USAF ACADEMY, COLORADO			4. PROJECT TITLE IMPROVE CAPEHART FAMILY HOUSING			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 8.87.46		6. CATEGORY CODE 711-111	7. PROJECT NUMBER XQPZ940030		8. PROJECT COST (\$000) 4,685	
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
IMPROVE CAPEHART FAMILY HOUSING		UM	75	57,760	4,332	
SUBTOTAL					4,332	
CONTINGENCY (5%)					217	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					4,549	
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (3%)					136	
TOTAL REQUEST					4,685	
MOST EXPENSIVE UNIT				\$74,595		
AREA COST FACTOR				1.05		
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Improve 75 Capehart units. Renovate kitchens and bathrooms and add family rooms, bathrooms, privacy fencing, garages, & trash enclosures. Relocate washers & dryers to main level & patios next to the family room/kitchen. Functional layouts will be modified and net square feet increased as required. Repair interior and exterior features and landscape as required. Mitigate radon.						
11. REQUIREMENT: 1,214 UN ADEQUATE: 506 UN SUBSTANDARD: 708 UN <u>PROJECT:</u> Provides improvements and repairs to 75 Capehart military family housing units. All units will meet "whole house/neighborhood" standards. <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> Project is required to provide adequate quarters for military members and their families assigned to this installation. It is the eighth phase of a multi-phase program which will renovate a total of 1214 units. 506 units were improved in the first seven phases. <u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> These units were constructed in 1959 with kitchens, baths, windows, and siding partially renovated between 1977 and 1983. Units do not meet current DOD standards. Kitchens need modifications to provide adequate storage cabinet and countertop areas. Most units do not have enough bathrooms. Formal/informal dining areas are too small and very few units have family rooms. The units require extensive maintenance and repair on plumbing, heating, and electrical systems. Laundry areas are poorly located in the basement. Landscaping needs to be improved for better drainage and separation of units. Radon mitigation is needed in some units to meet EPA standards. Existing carports do not provide sufficient protection from the elements. <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Air Force members and their families will continue to be housed in unsuitable conditions, affecting the morale and retention of quality personnel.						

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION USAF ACADEMY, COLORADO		
4. PROJECT TITLE IMPROVE CAPEHART FAMILY HOUSING	5. PROJECT NUMBER XQPZ940030	
<p><u>WORK ACCOMPLISHED IN PREVIOUS THREE YEARS:</u> Includes some radon mitigation (average cost, \$2,700/unit), some minor roof repairs (\$1,400/unit average), and basement leak repairs (\$4,500/unit average).</p> <p><u>WORK PROGRAMMED FOR NEXT THREE YEARS:</u> No work is programmed for the next three years in these units, although some roof repairs may be identified at a later date.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of construction, improvement, leasing, and status quo operation. Based on net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, preliminary findings indicate improvement to be the most cost effective over the life of the project. This project meets the criteria/scope specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide".</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)				2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION MOUNTAIN HOME AIR FORCE BASE, IDAHO				4. PROJECT TITLE IMPROVE FAMILY HOUSING			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 8.87.42		6. CATEGORY CODE 711-111		7. PROJECT NUMBER QYZH945003		8. PROJECT COST (\$000) 4,411	
9. COST ESTIMATES							
ITEM				U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
IMPROVE FAMILY HOUSING				EA	60	67,980	4,079
SUBTOTAL							4,079
CONTINGENCY (5%)							204
TOTAL CONTRACT COST							4,283
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (3%)							128
TOTAL REQUEST							4,411
MOST EXPENSIVE UNIT						\$92,100	
AREA COST FACTOR						1.10	
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Improve 60 family housing units by renovating kitchens and bathrooms, reconfiguring floor plans, improving interior and exterior finishes, upgrading mechanical and electrical systems, and remodeling garages or carports. Includes asbestos removal.							
11. REQUIREMENT: 60 UN ADEQUATE: 0 SUBSTANDARD: 60 UN <u>PROJECT:</u> Improve Appropriated Housing. <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> This project is required to provide adequate quarters for military members and their dependents stationed at Mt Home AFB. This project improves 60 units correcting design, construction and age related deficiencies to "whole house" standards. Project includes total renovation of all units, and conversion of selected units from four to three bedrooms. <u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> These units were constructed in 1948. All require repair and modernization to meet whole-house guidelines and current housing standards. The units have not had major renovation since construction, and are showing the effects of age and normal wear and tear throughout. Kitchens and bathrooms have outdated fixtures. Heating and air conditioning systems are inadequate and in need of replacement. Electrical systems no longer comply with national electric codes, and light fixtures are antiquated and inadequate. Some of the units have no direct access to backyards...access can only be gained by walking around the house from the front, which severely limits backyard use. The result is extremely cluttered front yards where barbecues and similar outdoor equipment is frequently located. Four to three bedroom conversions are needed to meet current requirements. <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Units will continue to deteriorate rapidly with							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION MOUNTAIN HOME AIR FORCE BASE, IDAHO		
4. PROJECT TITLE IMPROVE FAMILY HOUSING	5. PROJECT NUMBER QYZH945003	
<p>increasing age, resulting in excessive costs to the Government and inconvenience to residents. Without this project, repair of these units will continue in a costly, piecemeal fashion, with little or no improvement in the quality of life of the residents. Military families will live in inadequate facilities.</p> <p><u>WORK ACCOMPLISHED IN PREVIOUS THREE YEARS:</u> None.</p> <p><u>WORK PROGRAMMED FOR NEXT THREE YEARS:</u> None.</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> The proposed project should provide adequate housing for another 25 years with no additional major investments other than routine maintenance. This project meets the criteria/scope specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of new construction, improvement, leasing and status quo operation. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, revitalization was found to be the most cost efficient over the life of the project.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)				2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION SCOTT AIR FORCE BASE, ILLNOIS				4. PROJECT TITLE IMPROVE FAMILY HOUSING			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 8.87.42		6. CATEGORY CODE 711-143		7. PROJECT NUMBER VDYD924000		8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 7,705	
9. COST ESTIMATES							
ITEM				U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
IMPROVE FAMILY HOUSING				UN	107	66,590	7,125
SUBTOTAL							7,125
CONTINGENCY (5%)							356
TOTAL CONTRACT COST							7,481
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (3%)							224
TOTAL REQUEST							7,705
MOST EXPENSIVE UNIT		\$94,910					
AREA COST FACTOR		1.05					
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Improve 107 appropriated units. Upgrade kitchen/bathrooms, remodel interior, replace windows, install vinylsiding, upgrade/replace mechanical and electrical systems, reconfigure floor plans, add patios, privacy screens, and landscaping. Remove asbestos.							
11. <u>PROJECT</u> : Improve 107 family housing units. <u>REQUIREMENT</u> : Provide adequate housing for military members and their families meeting wholehouse standards. This is part one of phase 5 to revitalize 1,448 units; 250 units have been or are in the process of being improved. <u>CURRENT SITUATION</u> : These units were constructed between 1969 and 1973 and have received no major renovation, other than routine maintenance and repair since construction. Kitchen layout needs reconfiguration, cabinets, countertops, flooring, dishwasher, sink, disposal, and range require replacement. Bathroom commodes, lavatories, tubs, exhaust fans, and fixtures require replacement and half baths require conversion to full baths. Gas-fired furnace has exceeded its life expectancy, electrical wiring does not meet code. <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED</u> : Units will continue to deteriorate, exacerbating maintenance and repair costs. Quality of life for Air Force members and their families will continue to be inadequate. <u>WORK ACCOMPLISHED IN PREVIOUS THREE YEARS</u> : FY91 Expand parking, add storage \$117K <u>WORK PROGRAMMED FOR NEXT THREE YEARS</u> : None <u>ADDITIONAL</u> : This project meets the criteria/scope specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". These units are structurally sound and with this project will provide adequate housing							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION SCOTT AIR FORCE BASE, ILLNOIS		
4. PROJECT TITLE IMPROVE FAMILY HOUSING	5. PROJECT NUMBER VDYD924000	
<p>for another 25 years without additional major investments other than routine and cyclical repairs. An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of new construction, revitalization, leasing and status quo operation. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, revitalization was found to be the most cost efficient over the life of the project.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)				2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION WRIGHT-PATTERSON AIR FORCE BASE, OHIO				4. PROJECT TITLE IMPROVE FAMILY HOUSING			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 8.87.42		6. CATEGORY CODE 711-121	7. PROJECT NUMBER ZHTV820016P7		8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 3,822		
9. COST ESTIMATES							
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)		
IMPROVE FAMILY HOUSING		LS			2,539		
WHERRY FAMILY HOUSING		UN	70	30,860	(2,160)		
ADD TO & ALTER SENIOR OFFICER HOUSING		UN	4	94,750	(379)		
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					995		
OFF STREET PARKING		LS			(379)		
AREA LIGHTING		LS			(335)		
RECREATION		LS			(281)		
SUBTOTAL					3,534		
CONTINGENCY (5%)					177		
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					3,711		
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (3%)					111		
TOTAL REQUEST					3,822		
MOST EXPENSIVE UNIT				\$151,200			
AREA COST FACTOR				1.00			
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Improve 70 Wherry units and 4 SOQs. Work includes new plumbing, electrical, HVAC systems, refinishing interior surfaces, and reconfiguration of functional layout. Improve exterior by installing rear entry steel doors, provide patios, privacy fences, storage sheds and correct drainage. Construct additions to the SOQs to add authorized square footage. Provide radon mitigation.							
11. PROJECT: Provide "whole house" improvements to 70 Wherry housing units and 4 Senior Officer Quarters. REQUIREMENT: Adequate living quarters are required for families of military members assigned to this base. Improvements needed to the Wherry units include installation of rear entry steel doors, patios with screens for occupants privacy, and area improvements to facilitate family recreation, safety and quality of life. Additional living space along with minor reconfiguration and upgrade of utilities in the existing structures are necessary to bring these units up to the livability standards of similar quarters both on and off base. Upgrade of electrical, plumbing and HVAC systems is needed to comply with national building codes and to improve safety, reliability and economy of operation. To meet current family requirements, thirty-one oversized 4/5 bedroom units are being converted to address the base's deficit of 2/3 bedroom units. CURRENT SITUATION: The Wherry units were constructed in 1950's and have had no major improvements since original construction. Due to exposure to weather conditions and heavy usage the rear entry wooden doors have deteriorated. Because of the high density of this development, the occupants have no outdoor privacy. The SOQs were constructed in 1935 and have only had routine repairs and minor improvements. The wiring and							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION WRIGHT-PATTERSON AIR FORCE BASE, OHIO		
4. PROJECT TITLE IMPROVE FAMILY HOUSING	5. PROJECT NUMBER ZHTV820016P7	
<p>plumbing consist of original systems in both the Wherry and SOQ units mixed with some newer material added over the years. The existing room layout in these units are cramped and poorly arranged. The SOQs have only 1350 NSF, well below the authorized 1700 NSF. The proposed additional square footage will provide a master bedroom with bath and family room. The "C" type of Wherry housing unit requires additional square footage to reach the authorized space and internal renovation and reconfiguration to meet current housing standards. Accoustical and thermal insulation is also required.</p> <p><u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Air Force members and their families will continue to be housed in unsuitable conditions, affecting morale and the retention of quality experienced personnel. These units will continue to deteriorate past the point of repair, resulting in loss of valuable economic assets to the Air Force.</p> <p><u>WORK ACCOMPLISHED IN PREVIOUS THREE YEARS:</u> None</p> <p><u>WORK PROGRAMMED FOR NEXT THREE YEARS:</u> None</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> The SOQ units are eligible for the historic register. An economic analysis has been prepared comparing the alternatives of new construction, improvement, leasing and status quo operation. Based on the net present value and benefits of the respective alternatives, improvement was found to be the most cost effective over the life of the project. This project meets the criteria/scope specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide."</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION MCCHORD AIR FORCE BASE, WASHINGTON				4. PROJECT TITLE IMPROVE FAMILY HOUSING		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 8.87.42		6. CATEGORY CODE 711-111	7. PROJECT NUMBER POWY924004		8. PROJECT COST (\$000) 5,731	
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM				U/M	QUANTITY	COST (\$000)
IMPROVE FAMILY HOUSING				UN	70	75,700
SUBTOTAL						5,299
CONTINGENCY (5%)						265
TOTAL CONTRACT COST						5,564
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (3%)						167
TOTAL REQUEST						5,731
MOST EXPENSIVE UNIT		\$98,245				
AREA COST FACTOR		1.00				
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Improve 70 Capehart units. Enlarge entrance, add family room, reconfigure kitchen, upgrade mechanical and electrical systems. Replace windows, doors, flooring, plumbing, exterior siding, and patios. Add showers and 3/4 baths and expand parking. Provide neighborhood improvement.						
11. <u>PROJECT</u> : Improve 70 Capehart units. <u>REQUIREMENT</u> : To provide adequate housing for military members and their families meeting wholehouse standards. This is part one of Phase 5 to renovate 831 housing units; 509 have been or are under renovation. <u>CURRENT SITUATION</u> : These units were constructed in 1964 and have received only routine maintenance and repair since construction. Bathroom fixtures need to be replaced, tiling and plumbing repaired, walls refinished. Kitchen counters and cabinets are worn and broken, layout requires reconfiguration, washers and dryers need to be moved out of the kitchen. Windows are single pane; there are no storm doors. Insulation is in poor condition. Exterior siding is deteriorated and beyond maintenance. <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED</u> : Units will continue to deteriorate, exacerbating maintenance and repair costs. Quality of life for Air Force members and their families will continue to be inadequate. <u>WORK ACCOMPLISHED IN PREVIOUS THREE YEARS</u> : FY91 Repair roofs \$180K; FY91 Repair storage sheds/siding \$17K <u>WORK PROGRAMMED FOR NEXT THREE YEARS</u> : None <u>ADDITIONAL</u> : This project meets the criteria/scope specified in Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". These units are structurally sound and with this project will provide adequate housing for another 25 years without additional major investments other than routine and cyclical repairs. An economic analysis has been prepared						

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION MCCHORD AIR FORCE BASE, WASHINGTON		
4. PROJECT TITLE IMPROVE FAMILY HOUSING	5. PROJECT NUMBER PQWY924004	
<p>comparing the alternatives of new construction, revitalization, leasing and status quo operation. Based on the net present values and benefits of the respective alternatives, revitalization was found to be the most cost efficient over the life of the project.</p>		

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)				2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION WOOMERA AIR STATION, AUSTRALIA				4. PROJECT TITLE IMPROVE FAMILY HOUSING, PH III			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 8.87.42		6. CATEGORY CODE 711-143		7. PROJECT NUMBER ZGTT944002		8. PROJECT COST(\$000) 430	
9. COST ESTIMATES							
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)		
IMPROVE FAMILY HOUSING, PH III		UN	6	54,000	324		
SUPPORTING FACILITIES					43		
UTILITIES		LS			(14)		
PAVEMENTS		LS			(20)		
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		LS			(9)		
SUBTOTAL					367		
CONTINGENCY (10%)					37		
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					404		
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION AND OVERHEAD (6.5%)					26		
TOTAL REQUEST					430		
MOST EXPENSIVE UNIT					\$68,227		
AREA COST FACTOR					1.55		
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Improve 6 family housing units. Renovate kitchens and baths; replace HVAC, electrical wiring and fixtures, plumbing and fixtures, doors and windows, ceilings, and weatherize with insulation; repaint interior; landscape yards and install sprinkler system. Includes all utilities and necessary support.							
11. <u>PROJECT</u> : Improve 6 family housing units. <u>REQUIREMENT</u> : To provide adequate, modern, and safe family housing for military members and their dependents. Provide all needed repairs and improvements under one contract while the entire group of houses is vacant to reduce the cost of the work and to avoid inconveniencing an occupant and the neighbors. <u>CURRENT SITUATION</u> : Original insulation is 30 years old and thermal protection is inadequate for this harsh desert environment. Original window frames are difficult to operate and are not energy efficient. The existing reverse cycle HVAC systems were designed for use in the climate of Adelaide, South Australia, not the extreme temperatures found in Woomera. During the summer months, the temperature reaches 113 deg F and below 50 deg F in the winter. These units do not provide sufficient heating or cooling. The galvanized gutter system is corroded and leaking. Storm water drainage piping is broken and clogged from the debris flowing through the rotted gutter system. <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED</u> : The housing does not satisfy current Air Force Quality of Life Standards. Families are forced to live in facilities that are substandard and not consistent with the quality of today's housing construction. These units will continue to deteriorate at a rapid rate increasing repair and maintenance costs. <u>WORK ACCOMPLISHED IN PREVIOUS THREE YEARS</u> : None							

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION WOOMERA AIR STATION, AUSTRALIA		
4. PROJECT TITLE IMPROVE FAMILY HOUSING, PH III	5. PROJECT NUMBER ZGTT944002	
<p><u>WORK PROGRAMMED FOR NEXT THREE YEARS:</u> None</p> <p><u>ADDITIONAL:</u> Woomera is a joint defense community with the Australian Department of Defense. Our homes are integrated into the overall housing area and do not comply with the Woomera Village housing concept. The Australian government has been replacing their modular units with permanent brick construction.</p>		

ADVANCED PLANNING & DESIGN

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING
FY 1994 BUDGET REQUEST

ADVANCE PLANNING AND DESIGN

Program (In Thousands)
FY 1994 Program \$9,901
FY 1993 Program \$7,457

Purpose and Scope

This program provides for preliminary studies to develop additional family housing facilities, one time multi-phase design, and housing community plan developments; studies for site adaptation and determination of type and design of units; and working drawings, specifications, estimates, project planning reports and final design drawings of family housing construction projects. This includes the use of architectural and engineering services in connection with any family housing new or post acquisition construction program.

Program Summary

Authorization is requested for:

- (1) Advance planning and design for future year housing programs; and
- (2) Appropriation of \$9,901,000 to fund this effort as outlined in the following exhibit:

1. COMPONENT AIR FORCE		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (computer generated)			2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION VARIOUS AIR FORCE BASES			4. PROJECT TITLE FAMILY HOUSING ADVANCE PLANNING AND DESIGN			
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 8.87.42	6. CATEGORY CODE 711-000	7. PROJECT NUMBER XXXX94000PAD	8. PROJECT COST (\$000) 9,901			
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
FAMILY HOUSING ADVANCE PLANNING AND DESIGN		LS			9,901	
SUBTOTAL					9,901	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST					9,901	
TOTAL REQUEST					9,901	
10. Description of Proposed Construction: Architect-engineer services, surveys, fees, etc., in connection with advance planning and design of family housing dwelling units and properties included in or proposed for the Air Force Family Housing Account.						
11. <u>PROJECT:</u> <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> The funds requested are necessary to procure architect-engineer services to make site and utility investigations; one time multi-phase design, and housing community plan (HCP) developments; for the preparation of design and specifications of advance plans for future year housing programs in connection with any family housing new or post acquisition construction programs. <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Housing Community Plans cannot be developed. Advanced planning and design, site surveys, and other Architect-engineer services to support the new construction and post acquisition construction programs cannot be procured, therefore making these programs unexecutable.						

O & M SUMMARY

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING
FY 1994 BUDGET REQUEST

OPERATIONS, UTILITIES AND MAINTENANCE
(Excluding Leasing and Debt)

Program (In Thousands)
FY 1994 Program \$735,625
FY 1993 Program \$777,071

Purpose and Scope

1. Purpose: This budget request supports must pay operations and utilities expenses, as well as the maintenance and repair of our existing housing inventory at over 130 installations. Funding also provides referral services to members seeking housing in the private sector.

2. Scope:

a. Operations. This portion of the program provides for operating expenses in the following sub-accounts:

(1) Management. Includes installation-level management such as housing office operations, quality assurance evaluators, administrative support, community liaison, and annual service fee paid to the Corporation-Trust Company to provide the required corporate presence in Delaware. United States Air Force Housing, Inc., continues as the entity holding title to Capehart and Wherry real property. Housing referral costs are also included. The housing referral program assists personnel to find quarters in the private sector and implements the Fair Housing Act of 1968.

(2) Services. Provides basic support services such as refuse collection and disposal; fire and police protection; entomology and pest control; snow removal, street cleaning.

(3) Furnishings. Procures household equipment (primarily stoves and refrigerators) and, in limited circumstances, furniture; controls furnishings inventories; maintains and repairs such items.

(4) Miscellaneous. Includes mobile home hookups, leased office and warehouse space supporting family housing, payments to other Federal agencies or foreign governments to operate Permit Housing units occupied by Air Force personnel, and similar costs.

b. Utilities. Includes all utilities serving family housing, purchased and base produced, except telephone.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING
FY 1994 BUDGET REQUEST

c. Maintenance. Provides upkeep of family housing real property, as follows:

(1) Maintenance/Repair of Dwellings. Service calls, routine maintenance, repairs and replacement.

(2) Exterior Utilities. Maintenance and repair of water, sewer, electric, heat and gas lines located within family housing areas.

(3) Other Real Property. Upkeep of grounds, roads, parking areas, and other property for the exclusive use of family housing not shown above.

(4) Alteration and Additions. Minor alterations to dwellings or housing support facilities. Larger scope or higher dollar value items are funded in the construction program.

Operations and Maintenance Program Summary - Highlights

Authorization/Appropriation is requested in FY 1994 for \$735,625,000. This amount, together with estimated reimbursements of \$9,397,000, will fund the FY 1994 Operations and Maintenance program of \$745,022,000.

A summary of the funding program for FY 1994 follows (\$ in thousands):

<u>Operations Request</u>	<u>Utilities Request</u>	<u>Maintenance Request</u>	<u>Total Direct Request</u>	<u>Reimbursement</u>	<u>Total Program</u>
\$120,647	\$211,036	\$ 403,942	\$ 735,625	\$ 9,397	\$745,022

This request fully considers the effects of actual base closures and proposed overseas force structure draw downs and requests minimum essential resources to provide military families with housing in the private market, through assistance from a housing referral office, or in government housing. The Air Force's FY 1994 Operations and Maintenance program emphasizes the following areas:

* Maintaining the livability of the existing housing inventory worldwide.

* Reducing utility consumption per unit through a program of energy goals which places increased management emphasis on conservation and due to whole house improvement efforts.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING
FY 1994 BUDGET REQUEST

* Funding for government appliances and furniture consistent with cost/benefit studies, the delivery of new housing units which need government supplied appliances and the redistribution of appliances from closure bases.

* Reducing furnishings inventories in accordance with base closure schedules.

* Includes \$4.3 million for contract cleaning at overseas locations only. The budgeted amount will allow cleaning of approximately 17,200 units at an average per unit cost of \$248.00.

* Continuing the special effort to lower operations and maintenance costs in high cost quarters.

This budget request is for funds needed to meet must pay operations and utilities expenses, as well as the maintenance and repair of our existing housing inventory at over 130 installations. We also provide referral services to members seeking housing in the private sector. The Air Force shares the concerns of the Congress to improve support to military families and to properly maintain the housing inventory. This budget supports a long-range program responding to Congressional desires while considering the current environment of budget restraint.

OPERATIONS

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING
FY 1994 BUDGET REQUEST

Operations (\$ in Thousands)

<u>FY 1993 Est. Execution</u>	<u>FY 1994 Request</u>
\$128,423	\$120,647

The FY 1994 program represents Air Force family housing requirements and was developed using OSD/OMB approved inflation and foreign currency formulation rates. To the extent known, adjustments have been made for actual base closures and proposed overseas force structure draw downs. Each program sub-account is described in detail in the following analysis:

A. Management

<u>FY 1993 Est. Execution</u>	<u>FY 1994 Request</u>
\$46,354	\$44,282

Reconciliation of Increases and Decreases
(\$ in Millions)

1. FY 1993 President's Budget Request (Amended)	\$ 46.4
2. FY 1993 Appropriated Amount	46.4
3. FY 1993 Current Estimate	46.4
4. Price Growth	
a. Inflation (+1.1)	1.1
5. Program Decreases	
a. Decrease reflects a reduction in the number of units supported (-3.2).	- 3.2
6. FY 1994 President's Budget Request	\$ 44.3

Analysis of Changes in Management

The increases for inflation and pay raises for foreign national employees are offset partially by the decrease in units supported at bases projected for closure or force structure reductions.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING
FY 1994 BUDGET REQUEST

B. Services

<u>FY 1993 Est. Execution</u>	<u>FY 1994 Request</u>
\$26,633	\$28,183

Reconciliation of Increases and Decreases
(\$ in Millions)

1. FY 1993 President's Budget Request (Amended)	\$ 26.6
2. FY 1993 Appropriated Amount	26.6
3. FY 1993 Current Estimate	26.6
4. Price Growth	
a. Inflation (+.7)	.7
5. Program Increase	3.9
a. Program increase due to new EPA requirements (+3.9)	
6. Program Decrease	
a. Program reflects a reduction in the number of units supported (-3.1)	- 3.1
7. FY 1994 President's Budget Request	\$ 28.1

Analysis of Changes in Services

The FY 1994 budget has remained fairly constant with increases to cover inflation. A reduction has been programmed for projected base closures and overseas force structure reduction. At each installation, new EPA requirements must be met such as landfill restrictions, recycling, and an increase in testing to ensure toxic waste avoidance.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING
FY 1994 BUDGET REQUEST

Reconciliation of Increases and Decreases

C. Furnishings

	<u>FY 1993 Est. Execution</u>	<u>FY 1994 Request</u>
	\$45,681	\$43,543
		<u>(\$ in Millions)</u>
1. FY 1993 President's Budget Request (Amended)		\$ 50.7
2. Congressional Adjustment		-5.0
3. FY 1993 Appropriated Amount		45.7
4. FY 1993 Current Estimate		45.7
5. Price Growth		
a. Inflation (+1.1)		1.1
6. Program Decreases		
a. Decrease reflects a reduction in the number of units supported (-3.3)		- 3.3
7. FY 1994 President's Budget Request		\$ 43.5

Analysis of Changes in Furnishings

The FY 1994 estimate reflects continued reduction of furnishings and appliances, especially at overseas installations. Increased burden sharing is encouraged to achieve reductions in the dollars required. Also, in some locations, until the size of overseas dependent population is stabilized continued support is required to ensure homes are adequately supplied with appliances and loaner furnishings. In Europe, certain furniture items will continue to be needed. Loaner sets of furniture are issued to military families overseas to let them occupy permanent quarters prior to the arrival of personally owned furniture and to let personnel stay in permanent quarters after furniture is shipped due to a change of station.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING
FY 1994 BUDGET REQUEST

D. Miscellaneous

<u>FY 1993 Est. Execution</u>	<u>FY 1994 Request</u>
\$9,755	\$4,639

Reconciliation of Increases and Decreases
(\$ in Millions)

1. FY 1993 President's Budget Request (Amended)	\$ 9.7
2. FY 1993 Appropriated Amount	9.7
3. FY 1993 Current Estimate	9.7
4. Price Growth	-.8
a. Inflation (+.1)	
b. Foreign Currency exchange (-.9)	
5. Program Decreases	- 5.2
a. Decrease reflect accommodation change decrease (-.5)	
b. Foreign Currency exchange price decrease (-.9)	
c. Decrease reflect a reduction in the number of units supported. (-3.8)	
6. FY 1994 President's Budge Request	\$ 4.6

Analysis of Changes in Miscellaneous

The change in accommodation charges is for occupancy of units owned by the United Kingdom and the costs of units supported in Australia. These accommodation costs are incurred in accordance with requirements in host country agreements and are budgeted as "must pay" expenses.

UTILITIES

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING
FY 1994 BUDGET REQUEST

UTILITIES (\$ in Thousands)

<u>FY 1993 Est Execution</u>	<u>FY 1994 Request</u>
\$261,052	\$211,036

Reconciliation of Increases and Decreases

(\$ in Millions)

1. FY 1993 President's Budget Request (Amended)	\$ 261.0
2. FY 1993 Appropriated Amount	261.0
3. FY 1993 Current Estimate	261.0
4. Price Growth	
a. Inflation (+5.5)	5.5
5. Program Decreases	- 55.5
a. Increased burden sharing Government of Japan (-28.5)	
b. Decrease reflects a reduction in the number of units supported (-18.5)	
c. Decrease reflects economies and efficiencies (-8.5)	
6. FY 1994 President's Budget Request	\$ 211.0

Analysis of Changes in Utilities

MFH facilities consume approximately one-fifth of Air Force facility energy; therefore, MFH residents and management have shared--and must continue to share--a significant role in the achievement of Air Force energy reduction goals. Since MFH occupants are not billed for their energy consumption, conservation motivation must be rooted in other than financial incentives. The single most effective incentive is command emphasis. Energy projects to install set back thermostats, water heater jacket insulation and insulation of crawl and attic spaces have had good results toward the attainment of Air Force energy conservation goals. It is the overall goal of the Air Force to achieve a one percent per year per square foot reduction in energy consumption in its MFH facilities starting from a baseline of

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING
FY 1994 BUDGET REQUEST

UTILITIES

FY 1985 through FY 1995. We are near reaching this goal and have established another long term goal. It is to reach a 20 percent reduction in energy consumption for Air Force MFH facilities by the year 2000 using FY 85 as the baseline. The funding stream depicted in the following table is consistent with the Air Force goal of reducing energy consumption and costs.

<u>ENERGY CONSUMPTION</u>	<u>FY 93</u>	<u>FY 94</u>
Electricity (MWH)	1,859,857	1,796,999
Fuel Oil (Bbls)	401,013	395,922
Natural Gas (KCF)	6,807,387	6,469,249
Coal (MBTUs)	486,671	391,671
Purchased Steam (MBTU)	582,316	580,445

The Budget request for utilities in FY 1994 includes the costs of electricity, coal, gas, fuel oil, water and sewage treatment. Overall, utility rates are stabilizing. Continued conservation efforts are reducing consumption and costs. The reductions in energy consumption are also due to closures of Bergstrom, Carswell, Chanute, Eaker, England, Mather, Myrtle Beach, Williams and Wurtsmith at the end of FY 93. Additional closures at Grissom, Loring, Lowry and MacDill in FY 94 further reduces energy consumption.

MAINTENANCE

MAINTENANCE

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING
FY 1994 BUDGET REQUEST

Maintenance (\$ in Thousands)

<u>FY 1993 Est. Execution</u>	<u>FY 1994 Request</u>
\$387,596	\$403,942

Air Force family housing assets have a replacement value of over \$15 billion. Sound property management and economies dictate proper preservation and protection of these assets.

Reconciliation of Increases and Decreases

	<u>(\$ in Millions)</u>
1. FY 1993 President's Budget Request (Amended)	\$ 396.9
2. Congressional Adjustment	- 9.3
3. FY 1993 Appropriated Amount	387.6
4. FY 1993 Current Estimate	387.6
5. Price Growth	
a. Inflation (10.7)	10.7
6. Program Increase	34.1
a. Additional turnover maintenance as customers rotate because of accelerated force restructuring (+28.5).	
b. Reflects an increase due to repairs to slow asset deterioration (+5.6).	
7. Program Decrease	- 28.5
a. Decrease reflects a reduction in the number of units supported (-13.9).	
b. Decrease due to savings from Whole House Investments (-14.6).	
8. FY 1994 President's Budget Request	\$ 403.9

Analysis of Changes in Maintenance Program

FY 1994 maintenance request will not provide any reduction to our continuing backlog of maintenance and repair. Previously limited maintenance funding and a high occupant turnover has accelerated deterioration of the Air Force's aging housing inventory. Continued emphasis on maintenance and repair of dwellings is essential to assure availability of quarters for occupancy.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING
FY 1994 BUDGET REQUEST

Limited funding in prior years has resulted in temporary fixes while more permanent initiatives are slipped. Deferring such work has exacerbated the rate of deterioration in our inventory.

The Air Force continues to maintain dwelling units using a whole-house concept. Whole-house combines all requirements into one comprehensive project of which 68 percent is actually maintenance and repair work. Unexpected savings from the overseas lease program and from the increased burden sharing agreements for utility costs at Japanese bases have provided a source of funds to reprogram for dire maintenance requirements. Despite these reprogramming actions, MAJCOMs identified \$183M worth of unfunded ready-to-accomplish maintenance projects in FY 93 and another \$143M in FY94. The Air Force has minimized all maintenance and repair efforts at closure bases or bases scheduled for withdrawal.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING
FY 1994 BUDGET REQUEST

Backlog of Deferred Maintenance

Consistent with Congressional concerns, the Air Force is actively pursuing means to reduce its backlog of maintenance and repair. Our present goal is to reduce our end of year backlog to one year's normal recurring maintenance within the next 10 years.

Through the Air Force's emphasis on whole house revitalization, via our Post Acquisition Improvement Program (PAIP) and replacement construction, we have controlled the load on our maintenance account. PAIP and replacement construction is composed of approximately 68 percent maintenance and repair type work. As shown in the table below, when the limited available maintenance funds are combined with efforts in PAIP and replacement construction, the growth in DMAR is slowed. Additionally, reducing our beginning backlog in FY 90 to account for base closures has significantly lowered our initial backlog.

However, given the reduced funding levels in PAIP and replacement construction and maintenance in FY 94, we project a \$151 million increase in the Deferred Maintenance and Repair backlog in FY 1994.

The following chart illustrates the backlog of deferred maintenance (\$M).

Fiscal Year	<u>FY 90</u>	<u>FY 91</u>	<u>FY 92</u>	<u>FY 93</u>	<u>FY 94</u>
Backlog at Beginning of Year*	1,130	798	824	995	1,096
Normal Recurring Maintenance	415	422	656	590	601
Total Requirement	1,545	1,220	1,480	1,585	1,697
Funds Available Maintenance	315	333	442	388	404
68% of PAIP (P713) and Replacement Construction	75	102	96	150	95
Less Base Closures	395				
Total Funds Available	785	435	538	538	499
Backlog at End of Year	760	785	942	1,047	1,198
Backlog Reduction (Backlog Growth)	370	(25)	(157)	(105)	(151)

*Includes inflation and asset deterioration from prior year

**MAINT & REPAIR
OVER \$15K**

OVER \$15K

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING
FY 1994 BUDGET REQUEST

FAMILY HOUSING REPAIRS
(Exceeding \$15K Threshold)

This information is provided to comply with the 1984 House Appropriations Committee language that requires the Services to report any expenditures from the maintenance account which will exceed \$15,000 per unit.

UNITED STATES

<u>Location</u>	<u>No. of Units</u>	<u>Age of Units</u>	<u>Per Un Cost</u>	<u>Unit (NSF)</u>	<u>Project (NSF)</u>	<u>Total Cost(\$K)</u>	<u>Improvements/ Non-Routine M&R (\$K FY89-93)</u>
-----------------	---------------------	---------------------	--------------------	-------------------	----------------------	------------------------	--

CALIFORNIA

<u>Vandenberg</u>	172	35	18.0	1064	183008	3096.0	None
-------------------	-----	----	------	------	--------	--------	------

Narrative: This project replaces overhead galvanized water pipes that are corroded and leaking, ruining sheet rock walls/ceilings and light fixtures. The water pipes are full of sediment and flow is severely constricted. In some cases, hot water travels so slowly it is luke warm by the time it reaches the bathroom. The electrical system is a two-prong dated 1960 technology system that is incompatible with today's appliance outlets causing damage to appliances and the system. The 50 Amp services need to be upgraded to safely handle the load placed on electrical systems. This project will add a grounding wire to achieve a 3-prong system. The project is the minimal requirement to provide basic safe water and electricity to the homes.

MONTANA

<u>Malmstrom</u>	2	33-34	35.5	1289	1386	65.7	0.7
------------------	---	-------	------	------	------	------	-----

Narrative: Work includes all structural, mechanical and architectural work required to correct wet basements, replace foundation walls and floor slabs, replace partition walls, window wells, caulking floor slab perimeter, under floor slab drain system with sump pump, topsoil, and sod replacement for surface drainage. Due to ground surface settlement, foundation walls and floor slabs have heaved and cracked. Every time it rains or snow melts, water seeps in. Wells in one unit have moved enough to require natural gas to be turned off until repairs are made, thus the unit must remain vacant. Without repairs, other units will continue to deteriorate. Malmstrom AFB needs every housing unit available as it has a deficit.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING
FY 1994 BUDGET REQUEST

FAMILY HOUSING REPAIRS
(Exceeding \$15K Threshold)

This information is provided to comply with the 1984 House Appropriations Committee language that requires the Services to report any expenditures from the maintenance account which will exceed \$15,000 per unit.

UNITED STATES

<u>Location</u>	<u>No. of Units</u>	<u>Age of Units</u>	<u>Per Un Cost</u>	<u>Unit (NSF)</u>	<u>Project (NSF)</u>	<u>Total Cost(\$K)</u>	<u>Improvements/ Non-Routine M&R (\$K FY89-93)</u>
-----------------	---------------------	---------------------	--------------------	-------------------	----------------------	------------------------	--

TEXAS

<u>Lackland</u>	4	35-43	28.5	1169	4676	86.4	None
-----------------	---	-------	------	------	------	------	------

Narrative: These housing units have been out of the inventory for two years. Extensive termite damage has occurred requiring repair before the houses can be used.

OVERSEAS

GERMANY

<u>Rhein-Main</u>	1	34	91.5	1549	1549	91.5	None
-------------------	---	----	------	------	------	------	------

Narrative: Project provides utility maintenance and repairs to two SOQs. It was constructed in 1957 and has received no major renovation on the utility system. The electrical system does not meet US or German safety standards. The heating system is antiquated and energy inefficient. The uninsulated water lines are corroded, providing brown water to the occupant. The sewer system is deteriorated and periodically backs up into the basement. The remaining units at this housing complex received utility upgrades between 1980 and 1990. This is the last SOQ requiring this work.

<u>Sembach</u>	18	40	46.5	1398	25158	837.0	\$135
----------------	----	----	------	------	-------	-------	-------

Narrative: Project repairs the heating and electrical systems of these units. Present heat system is inefficient and unit electrical wiring (two-wire) is posing a safety hazard due to deterioration of insulation. Project also repairs kitchens and bathrooms to replace deteriorating plumbing and fixtures, repair plaster walls and floors, and replace water/moisture damaged cabinets. Finally, this project will provide the appropriate level of fire protection to these units.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING
FY 1994 BUDGET REQUEST

FAMILY HOUSING REPAIRS
(Exceeding \$15K Threshold)

This information is provided to comply with the 1984 House Appropriations Committee language that requires the Services to report any expenditures from the maintenance account which will exceed \$15,000 per unit.

OVERSEAS

<u>Location</u>	<u>No. of Units</u>	<u>Age of Units</u>	<u>Per Un Cost</u>	<u>Unit (NSF)</u>	<u>Project (NSF)</u>	<u>Total Cost(\$K)</u>	<u>Improvements/ Non-Routine M&R (\$K FY89-93)</u>
-----------------	---------------------	---------------------	--------------------	-------------------	----------------------	------------------------	--

GUAM

<u>Anderson</u>	200	34	30.2	1150	230000	6048.0	None
-----------------	-----	----	------	------	--------	--------	------

Narrative: Project will replace severely deteriorated elastomeric foam roofs with built-up roofs.

JAPAN

<u>Kadena</u>	68	30	53.0	1078	78352	3,604.0	6,800.0
---------------	----	----	------	------	-------	---------	---------

Narrative: Replace interior water piping, bathroom fixtures, wall covering, tile and trim, kitchen cabinets; repair electrical system, mitigate radon, and replace exterior drain pipe brackets. Galvanized iron piping has developed numerous leaks and clogging due to corrosion. Bathrooms and kitchens require renovation due to rusted fixtures, bathtubs, sinks, deteriorated cabinets, and walls/trim. All work needs to be done at same time to avoid unnecessary or redundant costs and to limit disruptions to occupants.

**GENERAL & FLAG
OFFICER QUARTERS**

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING
FY 1994 BUDGET REQUEST

GENERAL OFFICER HOUSING
(Exceeding \$25K Threshold)

This information is provided to comply with the 1984 House Appropriations Committee language that requires the Services to report any expenditures from the maintenance account which will exceed \$25,000 for all GFOQs.

UNITED STATES

<u>LOCATION</u>	<u>Qrts ID</u>	<u>Size (BSF)</u>	<u>Age of Unit</u>	<u>Ops Total</u>	<u>Util Total</u>	(\$K)	(\$K)	(\$K)	<u>Improvements</u>	
						<u>Main Total</u>	<u>Total O&M</u>	<u>Unit Cost</u>	<u>Non-Routine</u>	<u>M&R (\$K FY89-93)</u>

CALIFORNIA

<u>Edwards</u>	5308	2580	34	17000	3000	30.0	50.0	50.0	None	
----------------	------	------	----	-------	------	------	------	------	------	--

Narrative: Repair the roof and fascia of the GOQ by replacing the roof with asphalt shingles and replacing and repainting the fascia boards. Relocate exposed conduit and wiring. Include all work necessary to make this a complete and usable roof.

TEXAS

<u>Randolph</u>	300	4442	62	8000	3560	49.0	60.6	60.6	None	
-----------------	-----	------	----	------	------	------	------	------	------	--

Narrative: Repair driveway and parking area in front of residence. Correct drainage problems by demolishing existing driveway/curb and rebuild with lime stabilized subgrade, block base, hot mix asphaltic concrete. In addition, new curbs and gutters are necessary. Repair turf damaged in the process. Repair of driveway is required to provide adequate access to the quarters, and to prevent further deterioration of the pavement and curb.

OVERSEAS

GERMANY

<u>Rhein-Main</u>	628B	1752	37	1100	3400	103.3	107.8	107.8	None	
-------------------	------	------	----	------	------	-------	-------	-------	------	--

Narrative: Project provides utility maintenance and repairs for this GOQ. It was constructed in 1957 and has received no major renovation on the utility system. The electrical system does not meet U.S. or German safety standards. The heating system is antiquated and energy inefficient. The uninsulated water lines are corroded, providing brown water to the occupant. The sewer system is deteriorated and periodically backs up into the basement. The remaining units at this housing complex received utility upgrades between 1980 and 1990. This is the last GOQ requiring this work.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING
FY 1994 BUDGET REQUEST

GENERAL OFFICER QUARTERS
(Exceeding \$25K Threshold)

This information is provided to comply with the 1984 House Appropriations Committee language that requires the Services to report any expenditures from the maintenance account which will exceed \$25,000 for all GFOQs.

GERMANY

<u>Location</u>	<u>Qrts ID</u>	<u>Size (NSF)</u>	<u>Age of Unit</u>	<u>Ops Total</u>	<u>Util Total</u>	<u>(\$K) Main Total</u>	<u>(\$K) Total O&M</u>	<u>(\$K) Unit Cost</u>	<u>Improvements Non-Routine M&R (\$K FY89-93)</u>
<u>Vogelweh</u>	1050	1900	39	1100	3400	27.8	225.0	32.3	None
	1051	1900	39	1100	3400	26.0	225.0	30.3	None
	1052	1900	39	1100	3400	26.0	225.0	30.3	None
	1053	1900	39	1100	3400	26.0	225.0	30.3	None
	1054	1900	39	1100	3400	27.8	225.0	32.3	None
	2671	1900	39	1100	3400	27.8	225.0	32.3	None
	2673	1900	39	1100	3400	27.2	225.0	31.7	None
	2675	1900	39	1100	3400	39.3	225.0	43.8	None
	2676	1900	39	1300	3700	39.1	225.0	44.1	None

Narrative: Project provides for the complete replacement of the roofs of nine GOQs. These 39 year old roofs have become a continual maintenance burden. Repair crews are called out routinely to try to locate and stop small leaks that continue to cause damage to the support structure as well as the interior of the units. These units were programmed for improvement (which included roof replacement) in 1990 however due to the cancellation of the improvement program in Europe, the projects were never accomplished. The Air Force cannot economically wait any longer to repair these roofs.

PRIOR YEAR OUT OF CYCLE REQUESTS

JAPAN

<u>Kadena</u>	164	4608	39	5240	18483	67.0	90.7	90.7	315.2
---------------	-----	------	----	------	-------	------	------	------	-------

Narrative: In FY 1992 \$50,000 worth of operations and maintenance work had been approved for this GOQ. However, the work on the unit was disrupted by a typhoon, increasing the scope of work required in FY 1992 to \$90,706. The request from the Air Force to increase the scope of the work was submitted to the appropriate Congressional Committees on 1 September 1992.

REIMBURSABLE PROGRAM

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING
FY 1994 BUDGET REQUEST

Reimbursement Authority

Program (In Thousands)

FY 1994 Program \$9,397

FY 1993 Program \$8,275

The FY 1994 program is based on FY 1993 estimated execution and considers inflationary/price escalation increases in the cost of rents, utility rates, services, and maintenance and repair work charged to family housing. The increase in anticipated reimbursements is due to members who separate voluntarily being authorized to live in government quarters for up to six months after separation.

The following chart shows the source of receipts for the Family Housing account:

	<u>FY 1993</u>	<u>FY 1994</u>
Mobile Home Parks/Rent Proceeds, Other	\$8,275	\$9,397
Receipts from Sales of Housing Assets	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
TOTAL	\$8,275	\$9,397

LEASING

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING
FY 1994 BUDGET REQUEST

LEASING

Program (In Thousands)
FY 1994 Program \$118,266
FY 1993 Program \$150,800

Purpose and Scope

This program provides for worldwide leasing of privately owned housing and payment of the operation and maintenance of those units. The FY 1994 Authorization request for family housing is summarized as follows:

- (1) 9,201 foreign lease points,
- (2) 5,800 Section 801 lease points,
- (3) 3,333 domestic lease points and
- (4) \$118,266,000 for appropriation to fund leased units and related expenses as described in the following exhibits.

Reconciliation of Increases and Decreases

	<u>(\$ in Millions)</u>
1. FY 1993 President's Budget Request (Amended)	\$ 150.8
2. FY 1993 Appropriated Amount	150.8
3. Program Increases	-
4. FY 1993 Current Estimate	150.8
5. Price Growth	
a. Inflation (+3.6)	3.6
6. Program Decreases	- 36.1
a. Decrease reflects a reduction in overseas leases (-35.3)	
b. Decrease reflects reduction in CONUS leases (-.8)	
7. FY 1994 President's Budget Request	\$ 118.3

Foreign Leasing

Leasing in foreign countries is controlled by Congress. First by the number of lease points authorized, then by the review and approval of contract proposals, and finally by the funds appropriated.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING
FY 1994 BUDGET REQUEST

Foreign Build-Lease projects are completed. The Comiso AB 460 unit build lease is proposed for buyout in FY 1994. The Bentwaters 293 unit project was completed and occupied in the 1st quarter FY 1992.

A project to lease 75 existing units at Osan AB, Korea by conversion of 150 unaccompanied to 75 accompanied quarters was completed and occupied last quarter of FY92.

Domestic Leasing

In FY 1984, Congress authorized testing a new leasing program for U.S. installations in P.L. 98-115, Section 801. Subsequently, eight housing projects were completed and occupied: Eielson AFB, AK, 300 units; Hanscom AFB, MA, 163 units; Goodfellow AFB, TX, 200 units; March AFB, CA, 200 units; Travis AFB, CA, 300 units; Ellsworth AFB, SD, 200 units and 828 units; and Hurlburt AFB, FL, 300 units. Status of the other projects awarded is as follows: Cannon AFB, NM, 200 and 150 units, date of full occupancy scheduled for 1st quarter FY 1993; Eielson AFB, AK, 366 units, date of full occupancy scheduled for 4th quarter FY 1993; Andrews AFB and Bolling AFB, 414 units each in a combined project with the Naval District of Washington, date of full occupancy scheduled for 3rd quarter FY 1994.

Congress also authorized leasing of domestic units (10 U.S.C. 2828) on a temporary basis to satisfy critical requirements until a permanent solution can be found or if more economical than construction. In FY 1993, the Air Force requested an extension of 125 domestic leases to satisfy urgent requirements at Onizuka AFB, CA and extension of 60 domestic leases to satisfy urgent requirements at Los Angeles AFB, CA. The Air Force is supporting 12 domestic leased units for personnel assigned to the Armed Forces Radio and Television Service in Los Angeles, CA. Additionally, the Air Force is seeking authority to enter into domestic leases at Moody AFB, GA, 300 units; and Shaw AFB, SC, 250 units; for personnel displaced in association with the move of Air Force units from Homestead AFB, FL due to the destruction caused by Hurricane Andrew.

In FY 1994, the Air Force plans to begin termination of all domestic leases at Onizuka AFB, CA. The Air Force will use the cost savings to operate and maintain housing at Moffett NAS, predominately for Air Force personnel. All leases at Onizuka should be terminated by the 1st quarter of FY 1995. The Air Force requests an extension of 60 domestic leases for Air Force

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING
FY 1994 BUDGET REQUEST

personnel at Los Angeles AFB; 20 domestic leases for Armed Forces Radio and Television Services personnel at Los Angeles CA; an extension of 12 leased and an increase of 13 leases at Holbrook Radar Bomb Scoring Site, AZ; and an extension of 300 domestic leases at Moody AFB, GA and 250 domestic leases at Shaw AFB, SC.

FAMILY HOUSING, DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
ANALYSIS OF LEASED UNITS
(Other than Section 801)
FY 1994

LOCATION (OAC)	FY 92			FY 93			FY 94		
	UNITS AUTH	LEASE MONTHS	COST (\$000)	UNITS AUTH	LEASE MONTHS	COST (\$000)	UNITS AUTH	LEASE MONTHS	COST (\$000)
DOMESTIC LEASES									
Onizuka, CA (83)	125	1,500	\$1,744	125	1,500	\$1,745	67	804	\$936
Holbrook, AZ (78)	12	144	\$133	12	144	\$137	25	300	\$288
Los Angeles, CA (47)	60	720	\$728	60	720	\$728	60	720	\$748
Los Angeles, CA/AFRTS (47)	0	0	\$0	10	120	\$120	20	240	\$240
Moody AFB, GE (78)	0	0	\$0	300	3,600	\$3,600	300	3,600	\$3,615
Shaw AFB, SC (78)	0	0	\$0	250	3,000	\$3,000	250	3,000	\$3,000
Unassigned	3,136			2,576			2,611		
TOTAL DOMESTIC LEASES	3,333	2,364	\$2,605	3,333	9,084	\$9,330	3,333	8,664	\$8,827
FOREIGN LEASES									
Copenhagen (83)	4	48	\$60	4	48	\$56	4	48	\$58
Seychelles (83)	2	24	\$10	2	24	\$12	2	24	\$12
Ascension (83)	1	12	\$15	1	12	\$11	1	12	\$17
Salpan (83)	1	12	\$14	1	12	\$14	1	12	\$14
Alconbury (80)	250	3,000	\$3,190	250	3,000	\$2,788	250	3,000	\$2,880
Ankara (80)	206	1,752	\$1,893	206	1,752	\$1,741	206	1,752	\$894
Aviano (80)	83	720	\$796	210	1,596	\$1,511	265	2,196	\$2,368
Bentwaters (80)	779	9,348	\$9,465	779	5,532	\$5,503	300	3,600	\$3,783
Buchsschlag (80)	1	12	\$13	1	12	\$13	1	12	\$14
Corniso (80)	460	5,520	\$7,381	460	5,520	\$7,548	0	0	\$0
Dietzenbach (80)	108	1,296	\$1,204	108	1,296	\$1,216	108	1,296	\$1,309
Egelsbach (80)	52	624	\$577	52	624	\$583	52	624	\$627
Gellenkirchen (80)	1	12	\$26	1	12	\$26	1	12	\$28
Hahn (80)	300	3,600	\$4,065	300	900	\$837	0	0	\$0
Izmir (80)	9	108	\$250	9	108	\$206	9	108	\$230
Kalkar (80)	39	468	\$1,027	39	468	\$665	39	468	\$710
Lakenheath (80)	1,067	12,804	\$9,654	1,066	12,792	\$9,708	1,066	12,792	\$11,119
Nieder-Roden (80)	140	1,680	\$1,978	140	1,680	\$1,998	140	1,680	\$2,000
Oslo (80)	2	24	\$112	2	24	\$114	2	24	\$119
Paris (80)	1	12	\$37	1	12	\$34	1	12	\$37
Ramstein (80)	720	8,424	\$5,911	720	6,369	\$6,078	691	6,360	\$6,616
Rhein Main (80)	300	2,148	\$5,073	300	3,600	\$5,459	300	3,600	\$5,902
Rome (80)	4	48	\$80	4	48	\$80	4	48	\$80
San Vito (80)	151	1,812	\$3,210	151	1,812	\$3,026	150	1,800	\$2,878
Soesterberg (80)	190	2,280	\$1,989	190	2,280	\$2,078	190	2,280	\$2,273
Spangdahlem (80)	500	6,000	\$6,062	500	6,000	\$6,216	500	6,000	\$6,684
Torrejon (80)	858	10,296	\$14,821	858	0	\$402	0	0	\$0
Upper Heyford (80)	50	600	\$1,023	50	600	\$888	50	600	\$700
Osan (74)	276	2,862	\$2,476	276	3,312	\$3,288	276	3,312	\$3,119
Lajes (65)	2	24	\$12	2	24	\$12	2	24	\$12
Bangkok (63)	7	84	\$125	7	84	\$132	7	84	\$136
Classified Location (63)	0	0	\$0	3	36	\$100	3	36	\$103
Cairo, Egypt (61)	3	36	\$103	3	36	\$106	3	36	\$109
Nairobi, Kenya (61)	2	24	\$69	2	24	\$72	2	24	\$75
Unassigned	2,632			2,503			4,575		
Estimated Termination Costs									
Lajes, Portugal	330			330		\$3,075			
H. Oldendorf	90			90		\$585			
Bentwaters, Great Britain	488			488		\$1,590			
Woodbridge, Great Britain	300			300		\$1,363			
Hellenikon, Gr.	7			7		\$267			
Declmannu	1			1		\$25			
Torrejon, Spain	858			858		\$15,562			
Other Negotiations						\$12,140			
TOTAL FOREIGN LEASES	9,201	75,714	\$82,720	9,201	59,649	\$97,134	9,201	51,876	\$53,972
GRAND TOTAL FH-4	12,534	78,078	\$85,325	12,534	68,733	\$106,464	12,534	60,540	\$62,799

FAMILY HOUSING, DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
ANALYSIS OF HIGH COST LEASED UNITS
(Other than Section 801)
FY 1994

LOCATION	FY94 TOTAL LEASES Per Country	FY92			FY93			FY94				
		HIGH COST UNITS	HIGH COST Defined	ACTUAL COST	HIGH COST UNITS	HIGH COST Defined	ACTUAL COST	HIGH COST UNITS	HIGH COST Defined	ACTUAL COST		
DOMESTIC LEASES												
Los Angeles, Ca		15	12,000	189	15	12,000	193	15	12,000	194		
Onizuka, Ca		125	to	1,744	125	to	1,745	67	to	936		
None over Domestic Cap		None	14,000	N/A	None	14,000	N/A	None	14,000	N/A		
Sub - Total Domestic	722	140		1,933	140		1,938	82		1,130		
FOREIGN LEASES												
*Ankara, Turkey	215	1	5,338	60,000	1	2,968	68,000	1	1,814	70,584		
*Gelenkirchen, Germany	1,832	1	27,285	26,000	1	25,590	26,000	1	26,076	30,000		
*Izmir, Turkey	215	1	5,338	26,000	1	2,968	26,000	1	1,814	27,000		
*Izmir, Turkey	215	1	5,338	51,000	1	2,968	49,000	1	1,814	50,000		
*Izmir, Turkey	215	1	5,338	55,000	1	2,968	58,000	1	1,814	60,000		
*Oslo, Norway	2	1	25,578	67,000	1	23,685	67,000	1	23,318	69,546		
*Oslo, Norway	2	1	25,578	55,000	1	23,685	55,000	1	23,318	58,000		
*Paris, France	1	1	26,457	37,000	1	24,392	37,000	1	25,028	38,000		
**Egypt - 3 Units	N/A	N/A	N/A	103,000	N/A	N/A	109,000	N/A	N/A	109,000		
**Kenya - 2 Units	N/A	N/A	N/A	69,000	N/A	N/A	75,000	N/A	N/A	75,000		
**Thailand - 7 Units	N/A	N/A	N/A	172,000	N/A	N/A	132,000	N/A	N/A	136,356		
Classified Location - 3 Units	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	N/A	100,000	N/A	N/A	103,300		
Sub - Total Foreign		8		721,000	8		802,000	8		826,786		
GRAND TOTAL FH-4A		148	N/A	722,933	148	N/A	803,938	90	N/A	827,916		

EXHIBIT FH-4A

The HIGH COST domestic leases range between \$12k and \$14k per year. The domestic lease cost cap is \$14k per year.

* The adjusted cost cap for overseas leases is determined by multiplying \$20k times the FY 88 exchange rate divided by the FY 94 exchange rate. Leases exceeding this cap are defined as HIGH COST and are counted against the number of high cost leases allowed. Air Force is allocated ten HIGH COST Foreign Lease slots.

** State Department pool leases do not count against the total number of high cost leases allowed.

FAMILY HOUSING, DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
SECTION 801 FAMILY HOUSING SUMMARY
(Dollars in Thousands)
FY 1994

LOCATION	NO. OF UNITS	FY OF INITIAL AUTH	DATE OF AWARD	DATE OF FULL OCCUP	DATE OF FULL OCCUP	FY92 COSTS	FY93 UNITS	FY93 COSTS	FY94 UNITS	FY94 COSTS
Bolling AFB DC	414	FY90	SEP 91	DEC 93	DEC 93	\$0	314	\$2,406	414	\$5,408
Hanscom AFB, MA	163	FY84	SEP 85	OCT 87	OCT 87	\$2,733	163	\$2,733	163	\$2,733
Goodfellow AFB, TX	200	FY86	SEP 86	JAN 88	JAN 88	\$1,861	200	\$1,923	200	\$1,970
Andrews AFB MD	414	FY90	SEP 91	DEC 93	DEC 93	\$0	314	\$2,406	414	\$5,408
Hurlburt AFB FL	300	FY90	JUN 90	JUL 92	JUL 92	\$1,932	300	\$2,842	300	\$3,014
March AFB, CA	200	FY86	NOV 87	NOV 88	NOV 88	\$1,946	200	\$2,021	200	\$2,088
Travis AFB, CA	300	FY88	SEP 89	AUG 91	AUG 91	\$3,891	300	\$4,114	300	\$4,249
Eielson AFB, AK	300	FY84	JAN 85	JUL 86	JUL 86	\$4,638	300	\$4,638	300	\$5,079
Eielson AFB, AK	366	FY91	SEP 91	SEP 94	SEP 94	\$0	0	\$704	366	\$4,201
Ellsworth AFB (2), SD	828	FY88	AUG 89	JUN 91	JUN 91	\$8,650	828	\$10,090	828	\$10,379
Ellsworth AFB, SD	200	FY88	JUN 89	JUL 90	JUL 90	\$2,437	200	\$2,437	200	\$2,507
Cannon AFB, NM	350	FY88	JUN 91	DEC 92	DEC 92	\$3,541	350	\$3,541	350	\$3,632
SIOW Estimate/Maintenance						\$494		\$4,482		\$4,800
ANNUAL REQUIREMENT	4,035	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$32,123	3,469	\$44,336	4,035	\$55,467
Unused Lease Points	1,765					\$0	2,331	\$0	1,765	\$0
GRAND TOTAL FH-5	5,800	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	32,123	5,800	44,336	5,800	55,467

Exhibit FH--5

DEBT PAYMENTS

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING
FY 1994 BUDGET REQUEST

DEBT PAYMENT

Program (in Thousands)
FY 1994 Program \$21
FY 1993 Program \$70

Purpose and Scope

The Debt Payment program continues in FY 1994 in name only, as the last of the Capehart and Wherry mortgages were liquidated in FY 1989.

This program includes payment of Servicemen's Mortgage Insurance Premiums to FHA for mortgages assumed by active military personnel prior to FY 1980. These payments continue to decline to lower levels in FY 1994.

Program Summary

Authorization is requested for the appropriation of \$21,000 as follows:

<u>(\$ In Thousands)</u>	<u>FY 1993</u> <u>ESTIMATE</u>	<u>FY 1994</u> <u>ESTIMATE</u>
Servicemen's Mortgage Insurance Premiums	70	21
TOTAL OBLIGATING AUTHORITY (TOA)	70	21
Principal Payment		
Capehart	0	0
Wherry	0	0
Subtotal	0	0
TOTAL REQUIREMENTS (BUDGET AUTHORITY PLUS APPROPRIATION):	70	21

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING
FY 1994 BUDGET REQUEST

Servicemen's Mortgage Insurance Premiums

Servicemen's Mortgage Insurance Premiums, Section 124, Public Law 560, 83rd Congress, The Housing Act of 1954, aids in providing homes for members of the Armed Forces of the United States and their families through a system of FHA mortgage insurance especially designed to assist such members in financing the construction or purchase of homes.

This program was discontinued through Public Law 93-130 (Military Construction Appropriation Act, 1980) which allowed coverage only on existing mortgages covered prior to FY 1980. The amount needed to continue funding premiums on mortgages existing prior to FY 1980 continues to decrease. The program for FY 1993 and FY 1994 is as follows:

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Average Payment/YR</u>	<u>Amount(\$000)</u>
1993	380	184	70
1994	115	182	21